DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 584 AC 006 762

AUTHOR	Kiefer, George W.
TITLE	Staff-Training in the Illinois Youth Commission. Final Report. Volume III.
INSTITUTION	Southern Illinois Univ., Carbondale. Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections.
PUB DATE	Dec 68
NOTE	127p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.45
DESCRIPTORS	*Corrective Institutions, *Delinquents, Educational Objectives, *Inservice Education, Nonprofessional Personnel, Parole Officers, *Personnel, Professional Personnel, Program Evaluation, Staff Improvement, State Agencies
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois, *Illinois Youth Commission

ABSTRACT

The last of three volumes on inservice education for correctional personnel in Illinois, this report deals with the extent, content, and importance of inservice staff training within the Illinois Youth Commission (IYC), an agency providing rehabilitative and custodial services for juvenile delinquents. Functions and components of the three IYC divisions (Community Services, Administrative Services, Correctional Services) are outlined. Next, the relevance of IYC organizational structure and processes to staff training is discussed, and training objectives are set forth. Another section concentrates on staff training needs and activities in the Reception and Diagnostic Center, the Forestry Camp Division, and the Industrial School for Boys. A number of recommendations are presented, including those calling for a coordinator of staff training and program development, a full-time staff instructor for each IYC component, advanced counselor training for nonprofessionals, a corrections career development program, and creation of a manual of policy and operations. (See also AC 006 760 and AC 006 761.) (LY)

AC006762

10·80

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED038584

FINAL REPORT

VOLUME III

STAFF-TRAINING IN THE ILLINOIS YOUTH COMMISSION

by

George W. Kiefer

September 1968
(revised December 1968)

AC 006 762

ED038584

PREFACE

In the summer of 1967, this writer completed a rather lengthy report of activities undertaken as a correctional intern at Southern Illinois University. This experience was designed as an integral part of the master's degree curriculum in Sociology-Corrections.

The major portion of that internship and subsequent report was focused upon staff training in the Illinois Youth Commission. Substantial exposure to agency program and staff was utilized to further the skill-development and acumen so important to internship design. The internship report was written to serve two principal purposes: (1.) to meet the needs of academic criteria associated with an internship; and (2.) to evaluate staff training programming in an agency which, from earlier preliminary reports, was experiencing change in this area. Since the writer's professional concern includes a strong predilection for staff training in corrections, it is not unnatural to assume that he entered the internship with a number of preconceived ideas. It should be pointed out, however, that meaningful research/evaluation would not be possible without the investigator having a conceptual base from which to operate.

One further distinction must be made. The internship and report is not designed within the framework of rigorous research methodology. Indeed, this was not the intent. Rather, they might be best characterized as an exploration and evaluation based upon a conceptual framework. Findings are suggestive rather than absolutely demonstrable by repetitive scientific methodology. Nevertheless, for the writer, the total experience has been invaluable in promoting professional growth; and, for the agency, feedback commentary strongly suggests that the internship report has significantly stimulated agency staff towards an increased awareness and positive interest for staff training programming.

This report was originally prepared in September of 1967. Recently, we have updated and revised certain items to more accurately reflect a full and accurate picture. Nevertheless, we do not claim either infallibility or completeness. We do feel that this report accurately reflects our findings. Portions of the original internship report not relevant to staff training have been deleted from this revision.

SURVEY OF STAFF TRAINING IN THE ILLINOIS YOUTH COMMISSION

A. Introduction

This report is concerned with a survey made during the summer of 1967. At issue in the survey was the extent, content, and importance of staff in-service training within an agency providing rehabilitation and custodial services for juvenile delinquent, the Illinois Youth Commission.

The survey design was structured to be carried out so that a maximum of information could be obtained within a short period of time. In addition to surveying all available written information concerning the agency, interviews were obtained with a representative group of agency staff having varying levels of responsibility within the organization. Always, the focus of these interviews was on staff training activities within the agency; however, since staff training cannot be realistically separated from overall agency programming, considerable attention was paid to the latter.

Interviewing occupied the better part of six weeks and proved to be quite productive in eliciting factual information, attitudes, and informal agency policy related to staff-training. Respondents were receptive to talking with the intern about staff-training and showed considerable interest in the potential a final report may have for enhancing social change processes within the overall organization. Each respondent was guarandeed anonymity in the report in order that the climate would be maximally conducive to producing information free from agency control. At the same time, it was indicated to all respondents that the intern was conducting a survey of staff training for professional purposes and that the orientation would be development of constructive patterns conducive to training programming.

Organization of this report will include the following subsections, in the order given:

1. Section A, Introduction;
2. Section B, Illinois Youth Commission: Overall View of the Agency;
3. Section C, Illinois Youth Commission: General Relevances of Agency Organizational Structure and Process to Staff Training:
4. Section D, Illinois Youth Commission: Staff Training in Selected Agency Subunits;
5. Section E, Some Final Comments.

In addition to the above sections, a detailed set of recommendations pertaining to staff training activities in the agency will be included in the Appendix.

This report, while final for internship purposes, is hopefully but a starting point insofar as it may have value for the agency. If the report is accepted as factual and unbiased by the agency administration then it would appear incumbent upon agency administration to implement an enhanced staff-training program which is consistent with budgetary and staffing limitations. It is felt that the report organization, content, and recommendations form a logical base from which the agency can make possible the most effective staff-training programming.

Finally, it is our intention that the reader of this report understand that it represents the thoughts and perceptions of the writer. By the same token, the writer bears responsibility for what is written here.

B. Illinois Youth Commission: Overall View of the Agency

1.

The Illinois Youth Commission (I.Y.C.) is an official agency of state government providing services for youth. Since its creation in 1953, I.Y.C. has become the official administrative unit providing treatment and custodial programming for juvenile offenders committed to it by local court systems; and, through its Community Services Division, provides a statewide program of delinquency prevention services.

The agency has philosophy which might be paraphrased as, "treatment of the juvenile offender would be a long-range process of rehabilitation, rather than primary emphasis on custody and routine punishment, and moreover, that treatment should be patterned to center upon needs of the individual child."

Administration of the Illinois Youth Commission is formally placed in the hands of five full-time Commissioners (appointed by the Governor with Senate approval), one of which is designated as agency Chairman. All official acts and legal procedures are undertaken in the name of the Chairman who is the chief administrative officer of the agency. In addition to administrative duties, the Chairman and the Commissioners have responsibility for coordinating, planning, developing, and evaluating the many agency programs and facilities it operates. A crucial duty of the Commissioners (and perhaps the one bringing administration closest to the daily activities of its youthful clients) is its complete responsibility for parole granting and revocation --the combination of duties occupying a major share of Commissioner time. Especially in recent years, informal Commission practice has been for certain Commissioners to specialize in one agency subunit -- in something of a quasi-administrative advisory capacity -- and to provide a high-level communication link between that subunit and the Commissioners, as a group.

The agency is organized into three major units; the Community Services Division, the Correctional Services Division, and the Administrative Services Division. Each of these units is administered by a superintendent or supervisor who reports directly to the Chairman. The three units are broken down into a series of subunits, each with their own superintendents, supervisor, directors, and so on.

2.

The Community Services Division dates to 1939 when, as a division of the Illinois Department of Public Welfare it became the first state-sponsored delinquency prevention program in the nation. The Division has continually adhered to the philosophy of the Chicago Area Project established in 1934 by sociologist Clifford Shaw. The heart of this program is to encourage the widest possible participation of local citizens in regular and special organizations to work for prevention of delinquency. As stated in the enabling legislation:

> "The enlistment of local people individually and in groups in cooperative efforts to attack the problem of delinquency in their immediate neighborhood shall be the purpose of the Division of Community Services."

This report will not discuss staff training in the Division of Community Services since the intern's interest lay primarily in institutional and post-institutional correctional services. However, informal conversations with staff members of that Division lead to the presumption that organized staff-training can be strengthened.

3.

The Administrative Services Division functions mainly at the central office level and is designed to provide a variety of supportive services at the state level. Among the services provided by this Division are the following:

1. agency budget preparation;
2. agency comptroller functions;
3. agency personnel functions (including payroll)
4. agency part-time legal services;
5. agency statistical services;
6. agency public relations services;
7. central office business services;
8. agency purchasing services.

The Supervisor of Administrative Services performs a major role in acting as the business-management advisor to agency administration. He is the chief interpreter of fiscal policy and is a close advisor to agency programming, although not formally a part of such programming.

The Division of Correctional Services has responsibility for providing institutional and aftercare (parole) services. It is by far the larger of the three Divisions with slightly over 1600 out of the agency's total of 1800 employees. The Division has a number of subunits:

Oct. 1, 1968

	population	staff (full-time)	(Part time)
1. Reception Center for Boys (Joliet)	259	215	23
2. Training School for Boys (St. Charles)	680	391	56
3. Training School for Girls (Geneva)	249	293	32
4. Industrial School for Boys (Sheridan)	341	216	10
5. Special Education Schools (3)	154	101	14
6. Forestry Camp Division (10)	360	238	14
7. Field Services Division (Parole)	2699	112	2
8. Chicago Program Center	17	34	5

Additional units are in various phases of construction including two forestry camps.

Administrative organization within the Division of Corrections is rather complex because of the partial autonomy held by the superintendent of each unit. The Superintendent of Corrections has overall responsibility for all operations of the Division including planning and training. Until recently, the Superintendent of Corrections was a staff member without any special status as a Commissioner; however, when the former superintendent resigned, a Commissioner was appointed as acting superintendent of the Division and has continued to exercise this function. It is likely that the duality of roles thus assumed by the designated Commissioner lessens the amount of time he can devote to either role. Yet, outward appearances strongly suggest that the Division is moving forward at a healthy pace, and with considerable movement towards an integrated operation. Another complicating factor is the Forestry Camp Division which has its own superintendent in the agency central office, and, in addition, facility directors in each camp setting. The Field Services Division has a superintendent in the agency's central office, a number of supervisors around the state; and a Chicago metropolitan office which is (at least, informally) somewhat free from the agency superintendent's office.

As a result of this combination of administrative arrangements and difficult communication patterns, the Division is difficult to envision as an integrated unit working toward a set of common goals. The administrative structure of the Illinois

Youth Commission may place presumably burdensome limits upon the development of effective vertical communication patterns within the agency. If the previous statement is true, then the agency is in a difficult position when introducing agency-sanctioned programming innovations to its Divisions and subunits. In terms of staff training, this would seem equally true since impetus and support must come from agency administration to its subunits -- a direction which inadequate communication patterns and administrative structures would prohibit. In the Division of Correctional Services, it is the assumption of this report that, effective administration procedures are especially important in order that the matrix of correctional programming which has such a direct and influencing effect on the clients be closely integrated, if maximum achievement is to be obtained.

5.

A few words might be said here about the procedures involved in the youths becoming an agency ward. The Illinois Youth Commission receives wards from local courts because of one, or a series of, delinquent activities that have been brought to its attention. Wards are received in a commitment process (sanctioned under the Illinois Juvenile Court Act of 1966) which provides that a court, upon finding a youth is delinquent, may order his transfer to the Illinois Youth Commission for a period of custody, treatment, and rehabilitation extending up to his 21st birthday. Youths committed to the agency are transferred by local authorities to the Reception and Diagnostic Center in Joliet (or the equivalent facility for girls in Geneva) and thereafter the agency has legal custodianship until discharged by the court. At the Reception and Diagnostic Center, each youth is diagnosed, tested, observed, and evaluated by the clinical staff; and, after staffing, a plan is forwarded to the Commissioners for approval (which will involve a given placement and program for the youth). After a period in the placement setting during which the youth has made an adequate adjustment (as measured by various criteria), the setting supervisor will recommend that the youth be paroled to a community setting. If Commission approval is given, the youth will remain in the parole setting for a period before being recommended for discharge from further agency supervision. Again, Commission approval must be obtained before the youth is returned to the committing court for final official discharge. The above course is rather typical but a large number of exceptions exist; for example, the parole violator, the youth who is paroled directly from the Recption and Diagnostic Center, and so on.

It is apparent that at each point in the process just described, a youth will be in contact with one or more agency functionaries who will not only be directly involved in treatment and rehabilitation relations with the youth, but also are in a position to influence the youth's course within agency structures. *Such agency staff obviously represent all levels of competency, functions, and attitudes as well as many different professional and non-professional backgrounds*. Presumably, such different levels will function in a way which will be complementary to the youth-relational activities of other staff levels. Through an integrated agency approach to the total complex of youth-staff relational therapeutical efforts, such as would be enhanced and made possible by agency staff training programming, the agency will be in a position to fully focus upon what it considers as its main goal -- the return of socially rehabilitated youths to the community.

C. Illinois Youth Commission: General Relevances of Agency Organizational Structure and Processes to Staff Training

1.

Staff training programming which is conceptually conceived, systematically organized, professionally-oriented, continuously evaluated is not a major priority activity in the Illinois Youth Commission. For a brief period, one staff-member on the agency level held a position which was somewhat involved with staff training; however, in practice his activities were confined to an experimental program in one forestry camp setting with little time for agency-wide training program development. In addition, this staff member had other duties to perform which prevented his full-time attention to training. Recently, with his resignation, many staff have indicated their belief that the position would not be filled under present conditions; that is, a major emphasis on staff training will lack agency administration support until such time as the financial resources, staff, and facilities are available to meet and overcome the traditional resistances found among correctional staff. On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of staff interviewed indicated some degree of acceptance of training programming which is conceived so as to be relevant to specific problems and needs of the agency and particular setting.

At present, limited amounts of staff training exist on the local level to varying extents. In some facilities, only a rudimentary orientation training is provided; in some, periodic forms of in-service training will be found which is generally limited to one staff level; and in other, training for several staff levels is involved, but is underemphasized relative to the needs, problems, and helps which an effective program could properly address. At a later point in this report, a number of specific facilities will be reviewed in terms of present and potential training programs.

2.

It is assumed by most agency staff that the Illinois Youth Commission supports a therapeutic ideology in which the juvenile offender is viewed as essentially a victim of social and psychological forces which are constantly acting upon him. Further, the delinquent is viewed as potentially capable of being rehabilitated through a proper re-alignment of relationships in his social environment and personality. If relationships are as important as just suggested, then it is necessary that agency staff consciously plan for factors involved in the ideology of therapetutic treatment milieus:

1. Application of treatment techniques in an individualized manner to the unique set of problems posed by the delinquent in relation to his social environment;
2. Use of an appropriate relationship complex which is conducive toward the establishment of staff-youth rapport, to the end that both are involved in the treatment process -- rather than only involved in talking about the process and its contents;
3. A substantial degree of flexibility (and perhaps even permissiveness) allowed for participants in the treatment process;
4. A recognition by staff that "acceptance" of the youth is essential for positive systems of relationships to take place;
5. An increasing overall level of staff competence as more persons are directly involved in the treatment process.

It is through staff training based upon the ideology of a given agency and approach that treatment programming can gain its fullest development. Training can reach all staff levels to provide an awareness how each individual can best participate in the treatment program through establishment of enhanced relationship systems. In the case of therapeutic community ideology, for example, staff training can provide a broadened base of total staff competence in group treatment dynamics.

3.

Administrative and management staff interviewed in the survey were in general agreement that staff training must be organized from within the agency and be specific in terms of various agency facilities. The idea of a state-level coordinator for training was generally acceptable to this staff level, but much emphasis was placed upon meeting the needs of agency subunits through locally-programmed training rather than concern with a generic-orientation. Agency-wide coordination of training was seen as a useful device in support of local programs, especially in the following:

1. As an effective and focused liaison with agency administration to secure active support and encouragement for subunit staff programming;
2. As an innovator, creator, and "pusher" to help local subunits develop training activities;
3. As a developer of training methods and materials specifically applicable or adaptable to the agency and its subunits;
4. As a coordination agent for integration of training activities at all levels and subunits towards a goal of developing maximally-optimal conditions for effective treatment relationships to occur;

5. To provide a conceptual framework, adequately related to empirical practice, upon which planned change may be posited and related to implementation of a staff training program;
6. To evaluate subunit training activities, make recommendations relative to desirable modifications of such training, and help in the design of special training when innovative programming is being developed.

Such a state-level position was perceived as necessarily having strong support from agency administration to accomplish what appears to be desirably included in the role. At the same time, the occupant of such a position presumably would necessarily be circumspect in his relationships with local units since training programming, other factors notwithstanding, will remain in the hands of local unit administration. If the role occupant was "in sympathy" with the agency and its subunits, (that is, aware of the reality situation and willing to proceed from that point) was effective in relating behavioral science conceptualizations to empirical practice, and was adequately supported by agency-level administration -- then, a state-level staff training coordinator would appear to be of value to and accepted by agency staff.

Although the report is dealing with general factors here, it is appropriate to comment upon some specific factors pertinent to staff-training and which are relevant to any programming for training. Each has an agency-level base of approach although appearing in subunit activities.

1. Program content is necessarily based upon needs of the agency -- whether in terms of immediate problems or long-range programming of change. The question was raised by many staff concerning the nature of training that could be offered in the agency; that is, what will be taught? This report could not realistically explore training content because of the very breadth and depth necessary to satisfactorily answer the question. However, presumably such training would encompass an appropriately balanced program of content learning and sensitivity/T-group kinds of experiences:

   a. Determination of needs or problems as perceived by various levels of staff, both in terms of agency goals and employee role expectations;

   b. Observation by trainer of all staff levels in their daily work patterns, especially in terms of their relationships with administration, programming, and the delinquent group;

c. Appropriate conceptualizations by the trainer which coalesces his knowledge of the behavioral sciences and empirical practice, as it applies to (a) and (b) above.

Once staff training program design is aligned to a realistic awareness of agency and staff training needs, a realistic and focused program of staff training can be developed which will be complementary to both agency and subunit programming.

2. A well-conceived, systematic, and integrated staff training program will not be limited to one strata or phase of agency functions. While various activities will undoubtedly be the subject of special training, it is only within an overall context of across-the-board training design that any single such activity can be realistically provided. The notion of piecemeal training seems to be quite inappropriate for the size and complexity of an organization such as was surveyed.

Much variation in thinking was evidenced by agency staff concerning who should be trained; however, the prevailing sentiment was that all staff levels could use additional training (regardless of their length of service with the agency or status within it) -- provided that it would be focused upon the particular needs and problems of each staff level, both real and perceived. Incidentally, many comments were heard during the survey indicating that subunit administrators and management should be included in an integrated approach to staff training -- that is, they should receive appropriate additional training.

Another kind of comment frequently heard and appropriate to question of who should be trained involved a concern for staff time availability to become involved in training; that is, is agency staff too "busy" for training? While this may be a valid concern in a few situations, it puts the staff member holding such a view in a difficult position to justify. For example, if an individual can do a more effective job through appropriate staff training (as might be suggested through advances in knowledge in other situations) then his attitude of being "too busy for training" becomes self-contradictory. To place the situation in a philosophical context, the needs of programming for agency goal attainment must have precedence over individual roles within the organization although, in an effectively integrated agency, they will go hand-in-hand.

3. Funds for staff-training have not been available to the agency by direct appropriation until the current

legislative biennial budget (7/1/1967 - 6/30/1969) when approximately $100,000.00 was made available for this purpose -- this in a total agency budget of about thirty-nine million dollars (exclusive of building-bond payments) for the same period. Tentative planning by agency administration at the time of this writing in July of 1967 is to utilize all or most of the training appropriation for educational stipends and staff-reimbursement of tuition. Much smaller plans were made for investment of funds in on-going training programming within the agency. Current budgeting for staff-training is taken from other general categories and is always financed at the agency subunit level -- a situation not favorable to training when the subunit administrator feels his funds are more needed in daily operations. The latter situation is especially true if training is only minimally supported by agency administration due to priorities for use of available funds elsewhere.

This report is primarily concerned with what might be termed "in-service" training; that is, training given within the agency to personnel employed by the agency. The rationale for this emphasis is that staff whose main job is involvement in a relational treatment process must continually adapt themselves in the face of reality situations -- a requirement involving (a) continuing content input and (b) refinement of the ability to establish and use positive relationships in a treatment context. Pre-service training, such as is the case in a system of pre-employment educational stipends, is useful to establish a generic base of employee knowledge and skills which can be built upon when in the work-setting (and, of course, most effectively through a well-designed program of in-service training); however, pre-service training is only a beginning in a good training program.

5.

In-service training of staff, as a mechanical framework in the agency, can serve a number of functions in development of a cohesive, coordinated, and integrated total effort toward achievement of organizational goals. Although many functions will be touched on elsewhere in this report, a brief outline of the main points follows.*

I. Preservation of Agency Social System

  A. Communication of agency policy and procedures, especially as necessitated by changes in agency environment;

---

* -adapted from an article by Elmer H. Johnson, Ph.D., In-Service Training: A Key To Correctional Reform, 1967.

  - B. Readjustment of labor division among agency staff;
  - C. Prevention and alleviation of staff disciplinary problems;
  - D. Reduction of tensions associated with working in people-changing processes;
  - E. Emphasis on handling client (the delinquent) as an individual with certain needs, rather than concentrating on presumed needs of the organization (the latter being staff comfort).

II. Implementation of Organizational or Program Change

  - A. Increase percentage of staff members accepting a new program;
  - B. Revision of status and job-role system to more closely fulfill the needs of new programs (retraining, etc.);
  - C. Minimization of staff conflicts during the transitional process when new programming is being introduced;
  - D. Encouragement of formal and informal staff groupings acceptance and support of new programs;
  - E. Raising staff competence to levels required in content areas needed for new programs.

III. Development of Sensitivity

  - A. Aid agency staff to view situations from the delinquents' perspective;
  - B. Aid delinquent to perceive his own habitually inadequate responses to certain social situations;
  - C. Aid staff to develop awareness of the basis for self-images, as a factor to contend with in staff-youth treatment relationships.

In any case, a program of staff training is but a mechanism which can provide a means for obtaining the best possible set of conditions conducive to attainment of organizational goals. It is an effective channel for reaching all staff levels with a common message and program -- a vital necessity in an agency concerned with the people-changing process.

D. Staff Training in Selected Agency Subunits

1. Introduction

Several agency subunits have been selected for fuller description in this report. In addition to providing a brief background about the particular facility, special attention will be given to examining now-existing staff training practices. Insofar as is feasible, staff training will be related to the individual facility's programs, problems and needs. Some general kinds of recommendations will be incorporated where necessary in discussing aspects of facility programming, viz-a-viz implications for staff training; however, the set of recommendations for each facility will be found in the appendix.

2. Reception and Diagnostic Center

a.

The Reception and Diagnostic Center (R&D) opened at Joliet in 1959 in the abondoned physical facilities of a county work farm. Several functional buildings have been added since that time including four security-type dormitories and a gymnasium. The original buildings have been reconditioned and the entire institution has a sound, clean, efficient look. Facilities are crowded but a good degree of orderliness has been maintained.

R&D has as its main purpose the acceptance of male youths who are adjudged as delinquent and either newly-committed to the agency or, as is true in increasing numbers, returns from other agency facilities because of unadaptability to those settings. The R&D facility has virtually no discretion to refuse a commitment or returnee if the youth meets legal requirements for agency services. This has resulted in a continuing population pressure problem requiring that administration exercise sufficient caseload control to have beds available for new arrivals. The increased demands put upon professional staff at R&D by a combination of overpopulation and necessary casework with each youth produces critical situations within the professional role.

When a youth is received at the Reception and Diagnostic Center, he is initially assigned to the admission dormitory and given a briefing by a staff member -- the latter often being a youth supervisor. (Some say that the youth's real orientation to the agency and facility comes from his peer group.)
However, within the first day, a member of the professional treatment team assigned to the dormitory will talk with the youth in order to make an initial assessment of his needs, strengths, and problems. Accordingly, the youth will be assigned to one of the physical settings available while Center processes take place.

The newly-committed youth will be at this facility from four to five weeks, while "returnees" and recommittments will generally remain for a much shorter time. During the youth's stay, he will undergo a systematic series of tests, interviews, and observations -- all designed to explore his background; to make an extensive personality assessment; to measure his potential and achievement in academic or vocational areas; to evaluate any medical problems he may

. . .

have; and to subjectively evaluate his ability to positively sustain group-living experiences. Once the decision is reached by staff, it is communicated to the agency Commissioners for approval or rejection; most often the former.

Certainly, a team-approach is advocated and utilized at the Reception-Diagnostic Center. All dormitory personnel are involved in the approach and consciously strive to provide positive relationships in their interactions with the youths; however, there is a weighting of various staff member professional orientations giving differing shadings to the approach, and which is a matter of some internal disagreement. Nevertheless, the concept of a multi-disciplinary team approach to broaden staff perspective of youth being evaluated is presumably a valuable part of the Center ideology and practice.

Complementary to this multi-disciplinary approach is the opportunity for all staff members to develop an increased sense of professionalization; that is, they are involved in the institutional treatment programming rather than merely being assigned to a slot within the organization. In terms of this approach at R&D, it provides a program of consistent, integrated, and balanced relationships with lessened opportunities for manipulation by either staff or youths. The multi-disciplinary approach has also laid the basis for utilization of sound personal relationships as treatment rather than a dichotomous system of security and treatment.

R&D is primarily a diagnostic facility rather than a treatment one, although short-term therapy of various forms are occasionally provided. Bearing in mind the short stay a youth will have at the facility and the time needed for scheduling of testing, no formal educational program has been provided. Since the original report, a limited educational program has been added which, although new, is most positive and productive. Structured recreational periods are scheduled and other types of diversions used to supply positive outlets for youthful energy. Even in recreation, however, the youth is being observed by staff to add to a final composite picture presented at the decisional staff conference.

b.

On October 1, 1968, the Reception and Diagnostic Center had a resident population of 259. For this population, the R&D staff totaled 215 with a breakdown including the following fields: psychologists, chaplains, caseworkers, teaching specialists, and guards (equivalent to youth supervisors). In addition, a variety of consultants representing such fields as psychiatry, clinical psychology, social work, and so on, participate actively in the facility program. This relatively heavy leading of professional personnel (as compared to other agency facilities) has led to some thorny problems -- and these problems have significant implications for staff training programs.

1. It is not uncommon to hear agency personnel speak of R&D recommendations and personnel as being "ivory-tower idealists", especially as reflected in the Center's reports for classification and diagnostic processes. While unrealistic planning is occasionally seen in such reports (in terms of non-R&D staff preceptions) staff can only be so knowledgeable about non-R&D resources as they are in a position to receive such information from the field. The latter suggests strongly the necessity to develop mutual cooperation with non-Center resources (both inside and outside the agency) for beneficial informational exchange. If a real understanding of need is not communicated through the various

agency, subunit, and staff levels, the difficulties encountered in exchange of meaningful information effecting the youth will be correspondingly increased. At present, the Reception Center makes some efforts in this direction but will occasionally find itself rebuffed by other agency staff -- thus emphasizing a need for agency-level coordination of training activity. We would not, however, neglect the foundation upon which an R&D Center must be based; namely, that the client be diagnosed and recommendations made in terms optimal for rehabilitation of the youth. It would appear that the agency must provide that set of conditions most appropriate for securing of these recommendations.

2. A second problem area concerns the value assigned to activities of the Reception Center, both internally and by other agency staff. The question is raised by non-R&D staff as to whether the expenditure of time, talent, or funds is legitimate when the "real" place of Center functions is examined in relation to total agency programming for youths. For example, is the high ratio of

professional staff to youths (as compared with other subunits) seen at the Center realistic in the light of great professional-staff recruitment needs elsewhere within the agency -- especially if the "real" function of Center professionals is a perfunctory classification role. If the youths are merely being separated into categories at the Center, as some staff feel, then it is quite possible that this role can be assumed by others who are less highly trained -- thus, releasing professionals to other settings dealing in long-term treatment relationships. We would suggest, however, that the strength of R&D staff not be diluted through scattering and lessening impact. Rather, other agency units will profit from studying and emulating in appropriate ways the philosophy and professionalism.

3. Even though a multi-disciplinary approach would tend to draw consensus in a functioning team, it would be surprising if various points in the professional orientations of individual team members did not receive expression in opposition to agency policy or staff decision. While experience has demonstrated that the latter is usually worked out within the team, the

former is a somewhat more formidable problem. Indeed, a professional may be utterly convinced on the basis of his training and experience, that a certain course of action must be followed or avoided; however, over-ruling the recommendations of staff places that staff member in an uncomfortable (and perhaps ambivalent) position, even though such "overruling" is explained by the Commissioners in terms of final responsibility for operations remaining with administration. The explanation is not completely satisfying to the individual staff members. It would appear that this dilemma could be approached within a framework of in-service training. This would seem to be a case of "the boss is the boss", but the most effective boss is one who relies on factual information, persuasion, appropriate training, and mutual respect.

Each of these problem areas bears a definite relation to staff training programming as it could aid in providing a mechanism through which staff may most effectively seek solutions. It seems particularly appropriate in this context to point out once again that staff training, be it orientation or in-service, is not desirably restricted to one staff level or professional orientation. Rather, just as the most effective institution (whether it be mental, correctional, delinquent, and so on) appears to be one concerned with a therapeutic community approach involving all staff levels, so it is the most effective staff training will instruct both within and across all staff levels to the extent that is appropriate for staff abilities.

C.

Compared to most other subunits in the Illinois Youth Commission (with a major exception discussed later on), the Reception and Diagnostic Center has a moderately well-developed staff training program; however, this comparison could be misleading without an awareness of the limited ability for such programs in other subunits.

Recently, the R&D Center has instituted a special training assignment in the form of an added duty for the supervisor of social services. Although being quite busy with supervising the casework staff and field placements of social work students, the new training supervisor gives an impression of having considerable enthusiasm for the assignment. Primary emphasis of staff training activities to this point has been with the professional staff and, aside from on-the-job orientation training, concentrates on furthering the professional's knowledge of adolescent delinquent symptomatology and treatment techniques. The professional orientation of this training is grounded in the psychoanalytic school (and its close derivatives) and, at times, becomes quite divorced from consideration of the social environment as causative or precipitating of delinquency patterns. On the other hand, some eminently practical material is included in training (Manchild in the Promised Land by Claude Brown, for example) to acquaint staff with social environment and life-style conceptualizations for the social sciences. The newly-employed professional at the Reception Center is first oriented to his own special department; then to other departments; thirdly, to the broad outlines of agency policy and the somewhat narrower perimeters of Center policy; and finally, to the boys in the dormitories. In general, this orientation will continue under direct supervision until the new employee and the supervisor mutually agree that wings have been gained. The new employee will attend many group meetings and individual conferences as part of a structured-learning set of experiences. Later, periodic departmental staff conferences will offer further opportunities for specific or advanced training.

Administrative staff meetings are held regularly for the various department heads and other specified staff. These meetings provide an appropriate medium for a number of institutional functions: (1) distribution of information; (2) development of staff consensus, involvement, and support; (3) a platform for testing new new policy or procedure prior to implementation; (4) specific programming problems of management; (5) the creative opportunity to suggest institutional program refinement or innovation. It appears that staff attending such meetings are in advantageous position to perform a mission that in-service training will provide -- the communication of new or emphasized policy to all staff levels. To a large degree, this communication is effectively accomplished at the Center although occasional lapses do occur; the latter situation perhaps attributable to the unavailability of a full-time in-service training supervisor who can ensure such communication channel effectiveness.

A third area of staff training involves the complement of personnel in constant, daily, intimate contact with the youths. This would include the guards and youth supervisors (formerly called cottage parents). While this staff level does not have the virtual exclusiveness of contact with youths as is seen in other institutions of the agency, he will nevertheless occupy an important position in the locked-up world of our delinquent. Orientation training for the youth supervisor is primarily an on-the-job activity with most training responsibility being in the hands of his immediate supervisor. Very recently (Fall 1967) youth supervisors have been programmed into a well-structured and planned orientation program. Contact with professional staff assigned to a given dormitory is also quite intense, especially as the youth supervisor is helped to understand the youth, his behavior, and staff reactions to both. Here again, the multi-disciplinary team approach is a useful focusing mechanism for staff training by bringing all levels of staff into meaningful involvement with the therapeutic community approach for treatment. In addition to orientation training, youth supervisors have periodic staff meetings concerning administrative policy, situational problems, and treatment programming. It is my frankly subjective opinion that, on the whole, youth supervisor staff are basically competent and -- most importantly -- are open to further training which they could perceive as consistent with their institutional role and its concomittant role functions. A well-conceived, systematic, and agency-institution integrated program of staff training is presumably an effective way to provide such training.

A fourth type of training at the Reception and Diagnostic Center includes pre-employment stipends, tuition reimbursements, and similar programs for current or potential staff. By these avenues, such staff is encouraged to obtain further formal training which is deemed to be suitable for Center programming purposes. For practical purposes, this type of training has been almost wholly limited to acquisition of traditionally-defined professional skills. The program has had considerable success in this setting and a number of current staff members are products of pre-service stipends.

To sum up, the Reception and Diagnostic Center has a history of having various types of staff training for virtually all staff in contact with the youths. The main visible emphasis of this training has been on content although a good case could be made for suggesting that relationship-training has been included especially recently.

Recent training emphasis has provided staff-conferences of heterogeneous levels and orientations -- plus, a strong emphasis on advancing the competence of professional staff. Presumably, the task of diagnosing and treating delinquent youths (as seen in the Center population) is reaching new levels of complexity. If such is the case, then it would seem necessary to provide an expanded program of across-the-board training, giving special attention to the multiple roles and relationships faced by each staff member. Appendix C of this report will set down some recommendations concerning staff-training programming at the Reception Center.

3. Illinois State Training School for Boys (I.S.T.S.B.)

a. Introduction

The Illinois State Training School for Boys was founded at St. Charles more than a half-century ago. Presently, it is the largest Illinois Youth Commission facility and one of the largest institutions for delinquents in the United States. The institution occupies over 1100 acres, of which approximately 800 are in farmland, and has about 80 buildings. Of the latter, twenty buildings are normally utilized as residence-cottages for the youths. Although I.S.T.S.B. has a rated capacity of 550 beds, its actual population has been about 20% above the figure for the past few years.

The program of I.S.T.S.B. provides a medium-security setting for delinquent males. In this setting, the youths are subjected to varying combinations of treatment, rehabilitation, and custody during their stay -- a stay usually ranging from five to twelve months in duration. The normal age range of youths at I.S.T.S.B. is from fourteen through seventeen years (with the median falling at approximately 15.5 years). For this population, the primary institutional activity involves academic-attainment programming. Almost all of the youths will be in some form of academic program during their institutional stay, unless they have reached 16 years of age. When the latter occurs, the emphasis shifts toward providing vocational training or institutional work assignments although many youths will continue in academic programs. In part, this shift is traceable to the statutory requirement that all youths under 16 years be in an academic program.

In addition to the formal academic program and the limited vocational training program, I.S.T.S.B. has special programs involving institutional maintenance assignments, recreation, religion, counseling, and so on. Administration feels very strongly that each of these programs is a useful part of youth programming which substantially contributes to the attainment of institutional and agency goals; however, index criteria and research findings are unavailable to support the contention of this premise.

Youths come to I.S.T.S.B. from the Reception Center at Joliet. Most are moderately sophisticated insofar as acquaintance with delinquency-agency procedures are concerned. In addition to their stay at R&D, the newly committed youth will usually have been institutionalized one or more times in the local community. It is apparently quite unusual to find a youth committed to the agency who is mostly unaware of what it represents, how it functions (from the young client's perception), and how to "play-the-part" so as to suffer minimum personal discomfort while institutionalized. While much of such knowledge is accurate, a good deal of it is quite perceptive and oftimes more acceptable than agency staff information. The learning process continues after arrival at I.S.T.S.B. through a system of peer-interaction which supplies information to youths which they see as particularly important to their own situations. The formal institutional system of information-imparting functions side-by-side with the informal system to give the youthful client his own particular view of I.S.T.S.B., its goals, its meaning to him, and so on. Whether this communications system is adequate for institutional programming or even whether there might be some connection between communication patterns and effectiveness of programming is presumably a major implicit question for administration.

During a youth's stay at I.S.T.S.B., he is being observed frequently for evidences of positive changes related to "progress" in the institutional program. The youth is counseled by a variety of persons (discussed later in this report) and, after an acceptable period of adjustment to normative institutional patterns (plus a positive indication of patterns presumably essential for success in the free community) he will be recommended for parole. The institutional staff makes recommendations which, together with the R&D work-up, serves as a foundation for the parole agent to make specific plans for the youth's return to his home (or alternately, foster home) community. All planning must receive Commission approval before youth transfer may take place.

b. Staff Training at I.S.T.S.B.

Responsibility for staff training in this institution rests finally with the Superintendent of I.S.T.S.B. and the Assistant Superintendent; however, given the many duties that must occupy the time of these administrators and the rather low priority assigned to training for staff, only the most general phases of training are directly controlled at the top management level. As an alternative, training has been assigned as a responsibility of the Institutional Administrative Committee, the latter being a small group of department heads and the overall administrative officers of the institution. Reportedly, this Committee has had little past concern with training activity because of more immediate and situational problems it must face. Absence of top-level administrative direction for staff training has led to an uneveness of quality and quantity for staff training provided in the institution.

In actual practice, I.S.T.S.B. staff training emphasis varies widely through the various level of employee groups. For example, only minimal orientation types of training is supplied to most staff who are not in the professional, academic, or cottage-parent groups of employees. This orientation training is of an on-the-job nature and almost wholly concerned with the technicalities of daily job performance. Such training has given the new employee little (if any) awareness of agency or institutional goals, of treatment methods and the concomittants each will have for institutional functioning, or of the possibilities and ways which each employee may most effectively engage in the total-institution effort toward youth rehabilitation. Orientation training is usually quite brief for this employee group and is rarely subjected to any systematic sort of evaluation.

Generally, the professional counseling groups (including psychologists, social workers, youth counselors, and so on) attached to the Clinical Center and the academic/vocational training staff receive orientations to their various departments and will be placed with an experienced, mature staff professional to "learn the ropes". The new counselor will have frequent conferences with his supervisor in which specific youths and problems are discussed; however, these conferences are often only incidentially related to treatment programming and professional role development -- rather, they focus on the details of caseload management. While the latter is necessary in the reality of institutional programming, emphasis on this factor to the exclusion of professional growth, extended knowledge of new techniques and theories, or interest in understanding the agency as an integrated whole would severely restrict the value of a professional. As with the previous group, orientation training of the professional group is not systematized or integrated in a master plan -- nor is it sufficiently evaluated.

The cottage-parent staff is provided an orientation to their jobs by the supervisors within the administrative division responsible for cottage life. After a brief physical orientation to the various departments, the new cottage-parent is placed with an experienced parent for varying periods of time (usually from one to three weeks) and receives on-the-job training through a sort of osmotic phenomena. Occasional conferences are held for the cottage-parent staff to discuss specific problems and needs of the cottage staff, the physical setting, and the youthful residents. Focus is on the day-to-day custody and relationship needs within the cottage rather than in relating the cottage to total institution (and agency) programming. Perhaps this focus is justified if it can be assumed that the cottage-parent staff cannot or will not understand their special and important relationships to such programming; however, in terms of a therapeutic community concept being operable at I.S.T.S.B. (as some staff have suggested exists or should exist there) the focus would appear to be misdirected.

A very positive aspect of I.S.T.S.B. staff training is the periodic cottage staff conferences during which special problems, needs of individual youths, and so on are discussed in a permissive atmosphere. The conferences are normally attended by a representative sample of staff concerned with a particular cottage and will include (a) cottage parents, (b) case workers, (c) academic or vocational instructors, (d) and other interested supervisory personnel whose responsibility includes the cottage. As his time will permit, a consultant psychiatrist participates in these meetings to help the staff understand how they can most effectively relate with youths (in terms of positive impact produced) and, especially recently, how to deal with their own feelings toward the youth and his behavior. Role problems experienced by staff -- especially insofar as the oftimes seemingly conflicting needs of custody and rehabilitation are important -- are discussed in considerable depth and specific solutions sought. It is estimated that the consultant psychiatrist devotes approximately a one-day equivalent each week to this training activity.

Other activities have also been designated as staff training at I.S.T.S.B., but usually these conferences or meetings are concerned with treatment programming only as a "side" issue. It is reasonable to observe here that the size and complexity of this institution can account for much of the emphasis on "mechanical" procedures seen in current training activities. Equally true is the writer's observation that there is a slow, but increasing, movement toward an interest in additional staff training activity. If the preceeding two statements are true and if institutional programming is really something more than custody with perfunctory treatment/rehabilitative aspects, then staff training is one avenue to secure the most total institutional effort towards achievement of these goals. And, most importantly, it is staff training which is systematized, coordinated with the entire system of juvenile corrections, and strongly supported by administration (both psychologically and financially) which must be encouraged.

Personnel recruitment has been a major problem on all levels in past years. Until fairly recently, a combination of low pay, the stigma a public attaches to working in a correctional setting, and the nearby labor markets have accounted for substantial personnel turnover. In July of 1967, a new salary schedule went into effect which institutional administration feels will ameliorate part of the recruitment-retention problem. This is especially true of the cottage-parent group whose new salaries are approaching competitive levels with salaries obtainable in nearby employment settings. Recruitment of professional personnel will most likely continue to be a problem for administration due to the many desirable positions in this area. New salaries for professional personnel are marginally competitive, at best, with other social welfare roles available nearby. For a short time, I.S.T.S.B. offered educational stipends to promising college students with the expectation that these students, upon graduation, would work in the institution for at least a certain minimum period of time. Apparently, the stipend venture was not very successful since some students did not live up to their agreement -- or did so minimally. Currently, I.S.T.S.B. provides tuition-reimbursement for a limited number of employees, both professional and non-professional, who are taking courses in nearby schools. This latter program seems to be working well.

Staff training then, in summary, at the Illinois State Training School for Boys is not well-defined at the management levels; is somewhat spotty and of an uneven quality; only recently is related to overall agency or institutional goals; in large part, focuses upon day-to-day matters of a largely mechanical nature rather than on treatment, rehabilitation, and the youthful client; and, must therefore be assumed to have a low priority for institutional resources. This situation exists in the face of general acceptance by interviewed staff of the need for, value of, and presumed staff acceptance of the kinds of staff training activity this report implies is lacking at I.S.T.S.B. (i.e., the matters of treatment relationships in a therapeutic community concept.) Obviously, this institution will continue to function during the coming years, amplified training or not. The only point made here is that a properly-framed and supported staff training program could be advantageous to current and future I.S.T.S.B. administrators in their earnest striving to help, rehabilitate, and plan for the youths calling "Charlietown" their Illinois Youth Commission home.

Addendum:

I.S.T.S.B., in responding to an early draft of this report, provided a list of training activities operational in Fall of 1968. The list is reproduced below:

1. Psychologists/Counselors meet for one hour weekly;
2. Seminar: Psychiatrist and Clinic Personnel meet one hour weekly;
3. Clinic Director and Supervisors meet one hour weekly;
4. Chief of Social Service and Counselors meet bi-weekly;
5. Team Meetings: one hour a week with each team;
6. Psychologist and Academic Teachers meet one hour weekly;
7. Administration and New Staff meet ½ hour weekly;
8. Administrative Meeting: ½ hour weekly;
9. Teachers meet three times monthly;
10. Teachers Club -- monthly;
11. Area Curriculum meetings --as needed;
12. Scheduled contacts on a daily basis;
13. College Credit courses;
14. Semi-monthly cottage-parents meetings;
15. Semi-monthly Basement man meetings;

16. Semi-monthly Night man meetings;

17. Asst. Supervisor and Cottage Parents meet monthly;

18. Team meetings with Psychologist;

19. Staff sessions;

20. Waubensee Community College Lecture Series--weekly.

In addition, the I.S.T.S.B. Listing reports that orientation for new employees takes the following configuration:

Teachers: five days
Counselors: five days
Cottage Division: two weeks observation

c. Some Implications for Staff Training at I.S.T.S.B.

In this section, two topic areas will be briefly explored as they can or do relate to staff training at the Illinois State Training School for Boys. These areas are the therapeutic community conceptual scheme and the counseling process.

1. If it can be assumed that I.S.T.S.B. has its basic goals first, the return of a youth to the community without recidivism occurring; and second, establishment of a treatment situation in which relationships are so altered between the youth and social system of which he is part that he will adapt to norm-conforming behavior--then, it would

appear necessary for all staff to positively interact in the treatment relation setting insofar as is appropriate and possible for each role level. In this manner, contact points between staff and the youths will be greater in quantity, more effective in positive impact on the youths, and having more of a normative character. The therapeutic community scheme does not suggest that professionals are relegated to a lesser status, but rather that his talents are used in the most effective manner superimposed upon a healthy emotional climate of the youth which has been aided, systematically, by all institutional employees in their interaction with these clients.

Should this kind of treatment setting be valid at I.S.T.S.B., then a staff training program which will (a) sell the idea to staff and clients, (b) provide adequate levels of staff instruction to ensure program support, (c) provide for appropriate devices of evaluation and refinement would be essential.

2. Counseling services are formally provided by the

Clinical Services staff to all youths at I.S.T.S.B.; however, the amount of such guidance an individual youth receives is dependent upon a number of factors, many of which are only indirectly related to a planned program of treatment and rehabilitation. For example, the fourteen counseling-type of staff averaged a numerical caseload of 46 youths during the 1966 year (according to interpolation of official agency statistics). A weighted caseload which takes into account youth turnover, special procedural problems, and so on will produce a higher figure. In addition, when the agency-required paperwork is considered, the time available for youth counseling is considered, the time available for youth counseling is further reduced.

Two alternatives are possible to alleviate this shortage of counseling time: first, a sharp increase in the number of professionals available to perform this function; and, two, extension of the counseling function to the non-professional staff group. The first first alternative is not very practical in terms of economic possibilities or personnel availability. The second alternative has been utilized formerly to a limited extent and in special circumstances. However, informally the counseling function is an activity engaged in by many non-professional staff on a daily basis. This latter approach has apparently not been systematically explored and utilized by institutional administration, perhaps because the non-professional staff is viewed as presently incapable of adeuately functioning in this role.

If staff is counseling with youths informally, it is suggested that a need must exist which is not being met by the professional staff. The advantage of providing the non-professional staff with appropriate training for the counseling role, in the circumstances just described, are obvious. Respondents at I.S.T.S.B. varied widely in their feelings whether non-professionals could or should perform significant counseling functions. (It should be pointed out here that the institution has no definition of the counseling function, but predicates its view on a combination of educational level, involvement with youth, and personnel code requisites.) Most staff questioned indicated that, should counseling be a non-professional function sanctioned by administration within certain limits, then such counseling staff should be thoroughly involved in a continuing program of in-service training which would (a) systematically explore the functions and limits of this new subrole, (b) provide foundation information-input appropriate to the counseling subrole, and (c) psychologically support the incumbents of the subrole.

Again, the value of appropriate staff training which is adequate in intensity and related to subrole requirements has been demonstrated. It should be strongly emphasized that these circumstances presumably exist now to a substantial degree -- but, training for such circumstances has not been provided or focused on these areas.

At the Conclusion of this report, recommendations concerning staff training at the Illinois State Training School for Boys will be included in Appendix C.

4. Field Services Division

a. Introduction

The Field Services Division (parole) of Illinois Youth Commission is the after-care arm of treatment programming within the agency. For the most recent statistical period available (July 1, 1966 through December 31, 1966) an average of slightly under 3000 youths were being provided supervision by 91 parole agents and supervisors scattered around the state. Approximately 75% of these youths will be found in the Cook County area (metropolitan Chicago) while approximately 77% of the parole agents are in the same area. Caseload size for agents ranges from 15 (for an agent handling girls in a primarily non-urban area) to 60 or more in some of the more compacted areas of Chicago. Indicative of youth characteristics for this client population the following summary for newly committed youths during the final six months of 1966:

Total Wards Committed - 882

1. While ----- 221 Negro -----661
2. Male ------- 731 Female ----151
3. Cook County - 661 Elsewhere --221
4. Median Commitment Age -- 15.4 years

5. Residence at Commitment with incomplete family group ------------ ----- ------------ 601

6. (% with no male parent present - 47.8%)

7. Median I.Q. at Commitment Testing - 89.7

8. (Range 84.8 for Negro boys to 105.0 for white girls)

9. Median Formal Education Completed - 9.0 years

10. For youths discharged from jurisdiction during period, an average of 23.6 months under I.Y.C. jurisdiction.

The above statistics extracted from a 33 page official statistical summary gives a crude picture of I.Y.C. population and is a crude predictor of the types of social situations and problems which will be encountered by the Juvenile Parole Agent during his work.

The juvenile parole staff of Illinois Youth Commission is a separate unit with primary responsibility for programming of treatment and supervision between the time a youth leaves the institution and is finally discharged from commission jurisdiction - barring, of course, recidivism requiring return to institutional care.

Parole staff has a variety of duties to perform other than supervision, counseling, and treatment programming -- all three of these being related to client contact. Initially, the parole agent is notified by the Reception-

Diagnostic Center (R&D) that a youth has been committed. The agent must then compile a social history to provide standardized kinds of information (although by no stretch of imagination can the investigation procedure be termed either standard or perfunctory) for forwarding to R&D. In most cases, the agent will contact the family group, police authorities, school officials, employers, and other persons having special knowledge about the youth. In some instances, however, the agent must avoid certain of these contacts if the youth is to be served best. Many agents utilize this community exposure to publicize the Illinois Youth Commission program, and especially to start the preparations for return of the youth to his community. As time permits, the agent will attempt to foster and develop the basis for replacement of the youth at home, if this course is feasible. In the majority of cases, when the institution feels the youth is ready for parole, a parole placement request is sent to the Juvenile Parole Agent with recommendations incorporated for placement followup in the community. The agent has the privilege of accepting the institution-proposed plan or, should local circumstances be such as would vitiate against such placement, may suggest alternate plans for agency commissioner approval. Commission approval must be obtained before physical transfer of the youth. The next phase of his duties involves supervision and counseling of the youth by the juvenile parole agent.

However, before discussing these elements of his role, some comment should be made about the background and training of parole staff members. As with the majority of other Illinois Youth Commission personnel, parole agents are merit-system employees who seek to be identified in terms of uniqueness of specialization and a substantial degree of professionalization.

b. Training Implications

Certainly, many agents have an expressed feeling of being a unique group in their capacity for working with delinquent youth who have gone through institutionalization, a feeling which is fostered by parole administration. Critical remarks are often heard directed toward some other agencies (and oftimes even other agency units) in terms of these generalized others alleged inability to effectively and consistently deal in the open community with delinquent children.

For example, individual parole staff may be very critical of another state agency because their information concerning the latter may be fragmentary or incorrect. Because systematic knowledge concerning the services and procedures of these various agencies has not been adequately provided, the agent operates with false expectations. With disappointment, a false image develops and persists which effectively narrows the total range of services available to agency clients. Examples of agencies so identified by some agents, depending upon their caseloads and interests, include the Illinois Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Illinois Department of Public Aid, Illinois Department of Public Safety, Social Security Administration, local welfare agencies, and so on. This defensiveness, spoken with much sincereity is an indicator of the discrepancies in self-images which the parole agents have, both individually and as a group. This can be attributed in varying degrees to one or more of several factors:

1. The prerequisite training and education background of Juvenile Parole Agents is currently pegged at the bachelors degree, as minimal. Experience working with delinquents is considered desirable prior to employment as an agent. While some have not completed a B.S. degree, many agents without this extended educational background are

doing an excellent job in relating with youths under their supervision and setting the appropriate stage in which re-socialization can occur. The criticism can be suggested, however, that they may be going about their job without knowing the dynamics which are operating to produce change in the youth; without adequate role conceptualization to permit his changing positions without adversely affecting whatever relationships have been established; and without the insights offered into delinquent behavior by behavioral science conceptual and practical knowledge. The end result is that the agent who is doing a good job despite a limited formal academic background is unnecessarily limited to previous experience, sharpened judgement, and hunch (or perhaps a bias). Appropriate programming of in-service training could especially (1) help agents in this category attain a systematization of their valuable knowledge gained from past experience, (2) develop the agents ability to use new knowledge in conjunction with his past experience.. It is likely that the positive changes arising from such a program would be quite helpful toward boosting the self-image of parole staff -- in addition to the obvious positive effect that could be anticipated with youths supervised.

2. There is considerable feeling in social welfare practice that casework (and similar activities involving counseling) is either limited or almost meaningless in correctional settings because of the authoritarianism inherent in the situation. Proponents of such a view would probably agree that the juvenile parole staff is particularly suspect of this criticism since (1) despite any counseling attempt, the agent must act as an authority figure for the agency; and (2) the agent has virtually complete power and freedom to *initially* label a youth as a serious delinquent after parole -- and return him to the R&D Center as a recidivist. While some safeguards are built into the system, the fact is that the agent has almost total *initial* discretionary power to make such a return. Certainly, it would seem that the agent should and does utilize casework within the limits of an authority setting and, if the need arise, perform the duties necessary to prevent overt and serious breaching of its perimeter; but the point here is that for the agent to adequately separate the function (counseling) from the organizational structure (authority aimed toward security and safety for the community, the boy, and the agency.) *he must first be*

trained to make the distinction through appropriate insights sharpened through a program of continuing concept refinements and practical problems. Role definition of parole staff must be produced with clarity if this alleged dichotomy between counseling and authority is to be overcome. One final comment might be in order here. It is probable, based upon the writer's subjective opinion, that most agents are aware of this problem area and try to accommodate it to the best of their ability based upon background and training. It is especially to this group that focused training could be of great help. Those agents, however, who now remain unaware of this problem area most probably will need training in counseling theory and practice, since it can properly be construed as an indicator of limited practical ability to perceive relationships which are so very crucial to their helping role.

3. A third factor in producing a weakened self-image for the juvenile parole agent is related to his relative isolation, both in physical terms and in a feeling of being outside of the agency planning, treatment, and philosophical mainstream. Physical isolation is possible (even in the crowded Chicago office) because the parole unit is not

well-integrated into the philosophy, needs, and problems of other agency institutional units, as viewed by individual agents; rather it is a unit immersed in its own problems with youth supervision (and admittedly, these are almost overwhelming in numbers alone) to the point at which work in other units is perceived by agents as making them additional, often purposeless, work. As more than one supervisor has told me, parole agents are just extra spokes in a wheel to Illinois Youth Commission and ______________ (name of institution withheld).

The other factor in isolation is the many scattered offices throughout Illinois, which, through a desirable and probably necessary administrative arrangement, must be handled in such a way so that the staff located there will understand their role in treatment programming counseling, supervision, and most importantly, receive continued evidence of emotional and/or professional support and succor. Demonstrable support from the agency has been, until recently, infrequent -- as perceived by the agent. Support from parole administration figures could be sharpened and enhanced through a continuing program of training -- in its broader sense of support as well as instruction. It would seem particularly at this point that the functions of a staff-training program could objectively encompass these important needs of the agent and, given support by both the parole and agency administration, develop training programming to meet these needs, positively build upon this entree into the "system", and provide a service which will be perceived as useful by the agent group. In turn, this evidence of usefulness can be used as a point-of-departure for further training activity.

The term "treatment" is perhaps, at the same time, the easiest and hardest to conceptualize as it must exist in a parole configuration. It is easy in the sense that the only treatment traditonally available in parole is some form of organized relationships between the agent and youth, as superimposed on the community setting. In this view, treatment is focused upon the ability of agent and youth to establish an interrelationship in which the youth responds to his total community with the positve and normative social behavior patterns of that entity. Obviously, there is concern with social characteristics of the youth and his background; but, primary focus in this view is upon establishing positive feeling, role-modeling, rapport, etc., between the agent and youth as a therapeutic device for bringing about desired change.

A second view of treatment is difficult to conceptualize in the parole setting because change-value is attached not only to structuring of the agent-youth relationship, but also resistances or proclivities for change that are encountered in the total community of the youth. In this view, the therapeutic community concept which has been suggested as a model for institutionalization in juvenile corrections has been extended, in a very real sense, into aftercare programming. For example, many agents utilize the relatively simple technique of visiting the various major institutions occasionally. During these visits, the agent is able to establish a point of rapport with youths he will later supervise; while, at the same time, permitting and encouraging a productive dialogue to grow between agent and institutional caseworker. The agent must utilize all available community counseling or supportive resources to present the youth with a strong impact of helping relationships being offered from many sources such as the family, church, school, employment setting, other official and unofficial helping-relationship agencies, peer-group, etc. The agent following this viewpoint will spend time consolidating and propagandizing to various resources, in immediate situation "troubleshooting" when called by resources, and (hopefully) to help the youth understand his feelings toward his therapeutic community. To suggest just one use of staff training here, consider how much more effectively an agent can presumably be in marshalling resources for therapeutic-community programming if he has received practical instruction (perhaps including prepared information materials about the agency, delinquency, treatment methods, and so on) on the most effective ways to do this.

It is interesting to speculate how parole staff role is affected by recidivism and how treatment programming, both on the individual agent level and parole unit level, is affected by the recidivism phenomonen. For example, how much recidivism can an agent be expected to witness before it starts to take a toll in psychic energy available for work; how much before efforts toward an agent's resocialization of youths turns toward an increasing emphasis on authoritarianism and to having the youth "pay the consequences"; how much before the agent focuses mainly on breaking of resistance to authority-setting limits rather than on resistances occurring in the counseling relationship? It bears repetition here that the agent needs emotional and professional support and succor from agency and parole administration. If this is not provided in adequate amounts, it is likely to lead to a growing ineffectiveness in role performance by the agent.

c. Staff Training

According to agency reports, staff training programming in the parole unit is among the nation's best when compared with similar divisions in other states. Although specific funds were not earmarked in the parole unit budget for staff training, various activities have been liberally supported through drawing resources from other accounts. Elsewhere, we are recommending a request for formal legislative funding authority to provide for this activity. A minimum of six distinct training programs have been initiated for parole staff.

a. When a new juvenile parole agent is added to the staff, the normal procedure is to assign him for a period of time to the training supervisor in the

Chicago office. During this period, an attempt is made to expose the ingenune employee to both the agency and the parole unit. A training manual has been prepared by parole administration and this is required reading for the agent. After structured learning conferences with various Illinois Youth Commission personnel in the office, the agent is sent into the field with an experienced agent to observe how he handles himself, his relationships with the community setting, and how he obtains information through investigation for compilation in reports imparting concise and accurage summaries. The new agent's first written reports are evaluated by the training supervisor and constructively criticized in conference with the agent. Policy and technical practice of the juvenile parole agent role is again reemphasized to the new agent before he is assigned to his own caseload. It is felt that this type of orientation can supply only a basic introduction to (1) working with delinquent youth, (2) counseling techniques, (3) discussion of role conflicts, and so on. The assumption is made that this orientation will be followed-up by the immediate supervisor when an agent is assigned to a regular caseload -- perhaps an unwarrented conclusion.

b. One assigned responsibility of supervisors in the parole unit is to ensure effective role performance by his agents. To do this, he logically will have problem-solving conferences with individual or small groups of agents. And, in fact, job specifications for the supervisor role include training functions as a significant duty. To the extent that time is available, the supervisor attempts to present the agent with some form of continued training; however, the press of duties as perceived by some supervisors leaves precious little of their time to provide for such training. The obverse of this situation is seen in an initially rising level of confusion and frustration in many new agents due to their inability to accurately perceive and predict the responses of the agency and parole administration -- as well as the normal difficulties that might be expected in relating with the youths he supervises. Unfortunately, this is a continuing situation in the parole unit because of varying internal problems; but, the most important detrimental result that can be suggested is that, despite considerable presumable acceptance for the needs met by and advantages of staff training, the actual quality and quantity of in-service training is low. The question is also begged as to the wisdom of having immediate supervisors given sole responsibility for on-going in-service training, if the priority of this activity be elevated. It might be useful to place major responsibility for developing, implementing, and coordinating staff training at this level into the hands of a training supervisor who has the time and ability for actively leading a statewide program.

c. A third training activity involves an annual in-service seminar for all agents and supervisors held in a location where the entire staff can get together at one time. These 2 to 2½ day conferences feature nationally-known speakers who are experts in some content areas germane to the role of juvenile parole. There is usually the attempt to have some practical exercise involving the consultant speakers which will have a similar relevance. During the meetings, agents from different areas have much opportunity to discuss common problems, methods, and approaches to youth supervision and counseling. In this context, it is possible for some of the role-conflicts which are perceived as inherent in the job by newer agents can be satisfactorily resolved for individual agents. On the other hand, a serious difficulty in programming the annual seminar so that it will be of major value to the agent group revolves around a reluctance to accept the content and technique knowledge held by consultant instructors. The defensiveness of parole staff (and this is not a phenomena unique to I.Y.C.) becomes particularly noticeable at this point. A very real barrier is set up which the consultant instructor must overcome before he is in a position to make an impact upon the agents. Unfortunately, the time involved in overcoming such resistance oftimes significantly limits the productive time available for training - and especially since it is apparent that such "overcoming" does not carryover from one instructor to the next. While in a very real sense this must be considered a problem for the instructor, certain preliminary steps can be taken by the agency to make the process easier and more sure. For example, it is likely that a T-Group or sensitivity-training program would be quite helpful in the long run to lessen this source of training resistance. A point to mention re staff training is that continuing in-service training programming can be of such a nature as to effectively demonstrate the competencies of various agency units and orientations; as well as integrating the entire agency into a cohesive, functioning organization based upon a workable combination of productivity and mutual respect. The necessity for this integration and mutual respect is particularly necessary as the public and the courts become increasingly interested in corrections and the image projected by correctional agencies.

d. Meetings and conferences attended by a limited number of staff constitutes the fourth kind of training activity. Perhaps the best-attended example of this is the annual Governors Conference on Youth, a meeting attended by over 1000 persons. The Conference takes a different approach to adolescence each year, delinquency being equal to other youth problems. Travel expenses and press of workload are sometime stated by staff to be significant controlling factors in keeping down the number of attending agents to 50% or less. Other meetings include professional groups and resource development meetings. Again, there is some legitimate questioning by staff whether administration sincerely encourage such attendance -- a concern which probably lessens staff requests to attend additional conferences. However, it must also be pointed out that a certain small percentage of parole staff is adamantly reluctant to attend almost any kind of staff or professional conference. A few of these agents are so resistant to opening themselves to others, as might likely occur in a workshop conference setting, that they become ill and are unable to attend many sessions. This fear of self-disclosure by some parole staff (and the gross insecurity it implies in the agent's personality) protends ineffective supervision and counseling for youths under that agent's supervision. A coordinated and insight-producing program of staff training could substantially aid in alleviating the kinds of problems discussed -- by training for needs of the individual agents.

e. A fifth type of staff training in the parole unit is the structured meeting held by supervisors for the agents they supervise. In some instances, these occur rarely; in others, more frequently. These take many forms, ranging from non-Illinois Youth Commission consultant lectures to the taking care of a backlog of administrative housekeeping with all their agents present. This activity is essentially locally managed by the various supervisors.

f. And, of course, there is the annual meeting of Illinois Probation, Parole, and Correctional Association which, to varying degrees, provides a broader-scope type of staff training. All agents attend these meetings unless otherwise excused.

Other duties of juvenile parole agents include certain specialized activities for which the parole staff should have special training (again a function of an integrated and comprehensive staff training program); for example, the Juvenile Interstate Compact, participation in the Joint Youth Development Committee (J.Y.D.C.) programming; involvement in a referral program to the Illinois Division of Vocational Rehabilitation; etc. At present, informational programming for these areas is quite limited and any systematized staff training virtually non-existent (an exception being J.Y.D.C.).

Finally, the question of whether the parole unit is of enough importance in the agency to warrant the time, effort, and funds necessary to provide a comprehensive and integrated staff training program must be seriously considered. We feel, without reservation, that such expenditures are both essential and effective. It appears that the parole unit staff is generally of the opinion that they are important in agency programming -- "this is where the rubber meets the road" being a common statement expressing such feeling. By the same token, it seems reasonable to assume that the finest and most worthwhile institutional program become meaningless if the parole unit either is unable to provide the followup needed in a given program or is not fully in tune with total agency programming for youth rehabilitation. To encourage this effective integrated agency program, the value of an adequately structured, conceptualized, and practical staff training program cannot be over-estimated.

To sum up, the parole unit of Illinois Youth Commission has provided for a limited amount of staff training. While some of this training has been shown to be quite useful for portions of the agent group, training on an individual or small-group basis has been limited in its application thus far. Parole administration staff generally agrees that further staff training could be of value, but is hesitant because of cost and time involved. The obvious rebuttal, of course, is can the agency or the parole unit fail to do without further training and, if so, for how long?

Specific recommendations concerning staff training in the parole unit will be included in the Appendix section of this report.

5. Forestry Camp Division

a. Introduction

The Forestry Camp system was initiated with informal funding when the agency opened for business in 1954. From a makeshift camp staffed by parole personnel, the camp system has grown to include ten camps scattered around the state, the majority being concentrated in either the far south or northeast areas. The original stated purpose of a forestry camp system was to serve as an intermediate step between institutionalization and parole settings; however, the value of fresh-air camp programming was seen as therapeutically valuable to selected youths and the camp system took on new duties as an semi-automomous treatment programming unit. Until recently, only youths 16 years and over were placed in camp programming, because academic schooling was unavailable except in unusual instances; however, lately there has been development of educational programs permitting placement of younger age groups in certain camps.

Programs of the camp system involve some varying combination of academic instruction, vocational training, and work assignments -- through all of which runs the theme that rehabilitation can be best accomplished for a specific boy through the kind of program to which he is assigned. While this theme has validity in the abstract, its reliability in the reality of actual settings rests upon crucial assumptions: namely, (1) that treatment elements are incorporated in a program; (2) that such elements are being focused by staff as being central to camp organization and operation; (3) and that these elements have relevance as they are applied to the needs and problems of a given youth. But, until very recently there is but little evidence to believe that these crucial assumptions have been adequately incorporated or validated in programming design in such a way as will meet the implied requirements for a treatment model.

Pride in accomplishments is noticeable within the camp division and the administrative staffs point to, among other items, the value of services provided by youths for various public agencies. For example, the most recent available published report (for 1963-65) states that the value of such services during this period was a little over $950,000 including such activities as land conservation, providing a variety of manual labor services for nearby institutions (other than I.Y.C. institutions), helping in disaster situations, working to improve various local public facilities, and so on. The youths are paid a "nominal" sum for this work and the money placed in individual trust funds at the institution. He may make limited purchases at the commissary from this fund and receives any remainder when paroled. At the same time, administration is quick to point out that the services performed are not to be considered as a way to measure the value of camp programming -- rather, the value is in constructive work patterns which give the participating youths a sense of accomplishment and pleasure in seeing how their work can benefit others. (Preceeding paraphrased from official Illinois Youth Commission literature.) It is certain that some very searching questions will have to be asked before a staff training program of substance could legitimately be incorporated in the camp system. For example, concerning the above paragraph:

a. To what extent and in what ways do the allegedly constructive work patterns lend themselves to changing the youth (in terms of attitude or maturity) in such a manner as will coincide with his post-institutional needs in the specific social and psychological milieu he is placed?

b. Does the camp program exist to serve the treatment needs of resident youths or, as some have suggested, to serve its own organizational needs as related to program retention, avoidance of staff discomfortiture that could come with program modification, and the reluctance to subject one's self to criticism or judgement of another by encouraging program evaluation? Or could the two approaches exist together?

c. Is it possible to accept all of the anticipated and unanticipated consequences of withdrawing the off-grounds work program of a camp if validation research gave substantial indication that (1) treatment was not really being served by the work program and (2) a non-work program of some kind would give better promise of youth rehabilitation? For example, consider the value of services performed by certain camps for state mental institutions, and the cost such services would add to the agency budget should this relatively cheap source of manual labor be curtailed or eliminated.

d. In the case of working within the camp-setting, again the question of institutional needs as contrasted with the specific treatment patterns which can be expected to optimally produce desired changes in the youth, can be legitimately raised. Perhaps a work program would turn out to be the best, but how is this to be determined? Are the camp staff of sufficient educational and training background to understand the dynamics and processes involved in alternative treatment plans, prior to assignment?

e. If it is true that, as has been suggested elsewhere in this report, treatment is nothing more nor less than a relationship system building positive attitudes to the predominant cultural system, then is the camp prepared either organizationally or administratively to permit, encourage, and demand that relationships be such as will lead to the desired positive attitude changes?

It is not intended that the questions posed above should be seen as carping about the camp system. The point is simply made that for a staff training program which is based upon maximally providing opportunities for development of relationship systems useful in rehabilitation and attitudinal-change dynamics, it is necessary that the goals, real as well as stated, and the functional processes in the camp and total camp system be systematically explored and related to their interaction with treatment programming. The same statement is true of other Illinois Youth Commission units.

Administration of the camp system is provided through guidelines and direction supplied at the state level. Aside from overall policy and centralized fiscal planning, much autonomy in camp operation and treatment programming is placed in the hands of the individual camp directors. Thus, any staff training in the present camp division organizational configuration must necessarily work primarily through individual camp directors. In the past, there has been some experience with this kind of training coordination and, although occasional training efforts were undertaken, these were always at the pleasure of the camp director who was under pressure in many other administrative directions. Consequently, much less priority was given to training programming than might have been the case if an actively functioning training coordinator working on a regional basis was available.

b. Staff Training

Staff training in the Forestry Camp Division is not well-defined or particularly operational at this point. There have been occasional bright spots in various camps with specific programs developed to meet special needs. Two general types of staff-training are currently viable in the camp system; that is, orientation training and employee-problem meetings.

Orientation training is usually given to all new employees by the camp director and a co-worker he will appoint. Aside from explaining the rules and providing general information relative to what is expected by the camp director, any remaining orientation is usually supplied by co-workers (and obviously, by the youths with which he will have contact) in the form of learning-by-doing. This kind of training is not well-systematized; nor uniformly designed to meet overall agency need in insuring that the new employee has an understanding of his role and how his role is integrated into the camp program.

The second form of training for forestry camp employees involves occasional administrative meetings with the camp director. In these meetings, problems of supervision and the employees work requirements take precedence, with only minimal time devoted to teaching and discussing the organization of camp programming; viz a viz., its treatment value. Reportedly, such meetings are sometimes used by either the camp director or camp staff as a gripe session with criticism being leveled at the youths, the agency administration, etc. When this occurs, it is essential that some staff person be sufficiently trained and motivated (perhaps through a staff training program) as to be able to discuss the relevant issues to voiced criticism and bring the differing views together into a working approach toward the camp program. Whether this is being done now in all or most camp units is unknown, but likely very suspect.

In addition to the two types of staff training listed above, counseling staff and academic instructors will occasionally attend special meetings in various locations to further the notion of a common base knowledge for all "professional" employees. (Since counseling personnel need have only some college or certain equivalent work experience -- the term professional must be used with some caution for definition.) In addition, common problems are discussed and solutions sought based upon the shared experiences, a valid idea only if it can be assumed that the knowledge base for the group is high enough to relate such problems to treatment programming in an accurate, perceptive, insight-stimulated manner.

In discussion with the writer, certain camp directors when questioned about across-the-board staff training for camp personnel generally showed some disinclination to believe that all personnel should or could be trained. Most reasons were in the area of "could-be-trained" (for example, not enough time, or inability for some employees to learn, or no one to do the preparation necessary to do training "right") but there is some question as to whether the real resistance was not really in [illegible] allowing personnel to be trained in what is outside of their roles as now perceived by the camp director. When questioned about this, camp directors were quick to state that all employees at the camp unit have some effect on youths by their contact with them -- the very basis upon which a staff training program concerned with treatment programming (relationships) is founded. (It may be that recruitment of a better caliber new employee could be undertaken.)

Comment should be made upon one totally unique effort in treatment programming and staff training in the camp system, and perhaps, in the entire agency. This is the program undertaken at Pere Marquette Camp located about 40 miles north of St. Louis. In cooperation with Southern Illinois University's Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections (Edwardsville campus branch) a treatment programming model was conceptualized based upon accumulated knowledge from the behavioral sciences. The very idea of treatment was defined in terms of person-to-person relationships which would be structured in such a way as would enhance the youth's self-recognition as a productive, responsible, useful individual in the larger society. Through a continued series of such relationships, it was theorized that the youth being "treated" would have basic attitudinal changes towards a positive concept of the predominant community culture, and would learn to positively adjust to its broad outlines.

To secure staff cooperation in providing the desired type of relationships, a concerted program of staff training was undertaken utilizing as instructors, in addition to camp personnel at Pere Marquette, several faculty from Southern Illinois University on a contract fee basis. Various kinds of staff training techniques were utilized with emphasis being placed upon sensitivity training and T-Group methods. Despite considerable initial resistance on the local level, the relationships-as-treatment concept both prevailed in training and became viable in practice. While the treatment program has been difficult to objectively evaluate (although some effort is about to be taken in this direction) there is reason to believe that the program design was effectively implemented to the point where it was having positive change effects in the youths. Insofar as staff training is concerned, the activity was both concentrated in effort and often dramatic in overt changes seen in staff.

Two additional comments can be made about the Pere Marquette Camp program to illustrate how innovative programming (and by implication, the in-service training by which such programming is relayed from administration to staff) is perceived in the agency. The cost to Illinois

Youth Commission of this program has been approximately $500 per month for instructional faculty consultations and involvement -- this of course in addition to time costs for Illinois Youth Commission staff* Since the program has been in existence for several years, the question is being raised by Illinois Youth Commission why agency staff has not been trained to take over the consultants training tasks, and allow this money to be spent elsewhere. A second question is framed in terms of staff training being an internal function of the Illinois Youth Commission agency and asks -- why shouldn't training personnel, of the Pere Marquette Camp program type or others, be regular agency staff members so that their skills can be used more extensively and manipulatively by the agency? While the intern cannot speak for the consultant group, it is suggested that the questions just posed can be answered in terms of (a) a lack of Illinois Youth Commission personnel available to the camp who have the background (education and training) to be able to instruct in these areas, and (b) that it is highly unrealistic to expect such high-calibre personnel as the consultants represent to be available to Illinois Youth Commission, because of both financial considerations and work-research conditions which are a part of the professional research role. In short, the supply of such personnel is very limited and any agency using them must try to support them towards their most helpful effect for the treatment programming of that agency.

---

*Individual free or free arrangements with Southern Ill University staff, and no longer a project of the Crime Center.

While the Forestry Camp Division has some serious problems in terms of coordination and program design, this unit does offer many valid settings for rehabilitation of youths. Research possibilities are obtainable with only moderate effort (for example, by placing similar youths in two camps and contrasting their programs/staffs effect on the youths); but considerable effort would have to be expended in finding where the division *really* is in relation to the agency and its subunits, what are the real as well as stated purposes of the camp, what is the potential of the individual camp administrative design for program change, and how can staff training be best handled in this group of physically-separated facilities having small individual populations. These questions will lead to others and, if pursued constructively, could well lead to a unified philosophy for programming incorporating design concepts proved in behavioral research, and to a staff training be best handled in this group of physically-separated facilities having small individual populations. These questions will lead to others and, if pursued constructively, could well lead to a unified philosophy for programming incorporating design concepts proved in behavioral research, and to a staff training model which will be both effective and economical for the agency. It is suggested that the recommended Coordinator for Staff Training and Program Development, in conjunction with the division superintendent and other appropriate staff, would be in an excellent position to carry out this project.

c. Training Implications

It seems unlikely that camp directors are now realistically in position to develop and implement insight-producing staff training programs for camp personnel because of several reasons:

1. Training and educational background of camp directors generally falls much short of that which it is assumed, by persons professionally involved in training programs, to be adequate in terms of systematized and theory-practice integrated knowledge upon which training methodology must be

based. Thus, even though a training program is given at a camp, there is the strong likelihood that its design (and by implication the results obtained) will be of less effectiveness than the specially trained coordinator could provide.

2. The role of a camp director is that of a generalist rather than specialist. He is engaged in a wide variety of sub-roles consistent with the situational-demands of managing 35 to 50 active male youths in a setting which inherently has many constraints. Although he will normally have an assistant (who may be employed in one of several titles) the fact is that the camp director may, and often does, everything from ordering groceries for the camp from a local merchant, to cutting weeds, participating in decisions concerning a youth's parole, driving a dump truck to take youths to a work setting, and so on. The multitude of management details which a camp director perceives as his basic job role (rather than delegating many of these to other presumably competent personnel within the camp) severely limits his

ability to participate in innovation programming which, despite all design attempts to avoid it, will take his time.

3. A camp is a small Illinois Youth Commission agency unit which could, without psychological encouragement and a showing of real positive interest by the parent agency, tend toward isolationistic closeness and reluctance to "move" on its own initiative; but, in this type of agency organizational setup, continuing and positive initiative is not readily demonstrated by the state agency as viewed by some camp staff. In a sense, this is a communications gulf with both the camp and the state agency awaiting the other's show of interest before programming is altered. It is not realistic to expect a camp director to be sympathetic to the demands, both philosophical and material, that a treatment-based staff training program would require -- unless such a programming orientation is proferred by the agency in terms readily translatable into local action by the camp director.

4. Although several camp directors indicated to the intern a favorable view of staff training, further conversation revealed that there was little idea of what should be provided as training content, how training time could be provided within present personnel and budget limitations, or that training must be completely integrated with the needs and functions of individual unit's treatment. It is essential that any staff training program presented or co-ordinated from the state level must (1) have full support of the camp director and (2) provide for appropriate training which will include the camp director as a learner as well as instructor.

6. Illinois Industrial School for Boys

a. Introduction

The Illinois Industrial School for Boys (I.I.S.B.) at Sheridan about 60 miles southwest of Chicago is the maximum-security institution of the Illinois Youth Commission. Within its barbed-wire topped double cyclone-style fence are 42 acres of closely-guarded area in which the resident youth work, play, study, and are treated.

Emphasis has traditionally been placed upon custody and security, but there has been a decided trend toward education and guidance. The institution had its origin in 1940 as a reformatory for young offenders but became part of Commission in 1954. Some of the younger original inmates were retained by the Illinois Youth Commission but most were transferred to various facilities of the Illinois Department of Public Safety for further custody and treatment. Presently, its plus-300 population is mainly composed of youths who either (a) are so physically aggressive that other institutions consider them harmful to their programs; (b) are strong run-risks; or (c) in some cases, have committed offenses of such seriousness (murder, rape, etc.) that the Commission feels it necessary to keep them in close confinement. Staff numbers slightly over two hundred employees.

The total institution covers 320 acres of which 240 are in agricultural purposes, 30 acres in a separate staff-housing area, and including 42 acres within the security perimeter. Inside the perimeter are nineteen buildings, four of them used as residences for youths. Three types of housing exist at I.I.S.B.; a dormitory arrangement, individual rooms in a cellblock type of setting, and an isolation unit equalling that found in most adult correctional settings. Because of security needs and the relative permanence of construction at I.I.S.B., the institution is particularly concerned about its population problems -- especially if additional boys are added beyond its 290 bed rated capacity. The most recent statistical report of the Commission indicated that I.I.S.B. had an average daily population of 309. My impression of physical facilities is one of structural soundness and a good degree of cleanliness.

A few comments might be in order on the attitude of both the boys and staff. Probably the most general statement appropriate is that I.I.S.B. has a history of maximum security and custody orientation, and that this history is seen in the form institutional programs have taken to this day. This is true even though few personnel (on any level) have remained at I.I.S.B. since the time that a security-custody philosophy was openly espoused. For example, one of the guards interviewed by the intern some time ago spoke of I.I.S.B. having one purpose --custody. He went on to indicate that any treatment programming ("frill stuff") superimposed upon this basic security would be allowed at his own pleasure, despite threats or advocacy by administration. While others spoke with considerably less openness, it seems apparent that some were less-than-ready to accept new programs or major variations in their daily activities. Behind this reluctance lies at least two factors which administration must understand (and then program to modify) if any new institutional treatment programming is to be optimally free from staff interference, non-wholehearted support, or (at the worst) deliberate sabotage:

1. Many authors have commented upon staff fears when a change is proposed in their job (or a change is proposed which they perceive as a job change). Part of this is tied to a general uncomfortable feeling in the face of newness or the unknown. However, beyond this is the complex of attitudes tied to a person's employment and how he perceives the meaning of his work role. For example, does a program change contain any threat to job continuation for the employee, either in reality or as he may see it? Or again,

what relation will a program change have to the kind of attitudes both allegedly existing and immutable in the employee's personality? A Third kind of question might relate to how an employee perceives the value attached to specific work patterns; that is, can the guard whose role traditionally had little formalized interaction with youths change to include structured interaction (such as is seen in group counseling) without changing his relationship attitudes toward the youth, the community, and the institution? Without adequate staff preparation for change, the degree of resistance to such change will most certainly be strong and detrimental to achieving positive program results.

2. A second factor is concerned with the complex of attitudes about the nature of delinquent youth and corrections; that is, are delinquents basically evil and incorrigible, or more omniously, does the institution do anything more for the resident youths than provide temporary custody before a career in delinquency and criminal activity is resumed? Certainly, the daily press

> and media indicate the feeling about irremediability of the delinquent or criminal (and often equated terms) and his probable return to such activity after release from institutional care. This is reflected in the common statement -- "once a criminal, always a criminal." It is reasonable to assume that the complex of attitudes held by staff regarding the institution's youthful client will be important, perhaps crucially so, as a background for any innovative programming.

While the two items mentioned above are important throughout the Commission, insofar as staff attitudes effect on new programming may be concerned, it is particularly noticeable at I.I.S.B. because of a long security-orientation history.

On the positive side (and keeping in mind certain reservations suggested by the previous few paragraphs) there is a decided change which is showing at I.I.S.B. in terms of the variety of youth-need-centered programs that have been undertaken in the past two or three years. To give one significant example, there has been a substantial effort made at I.I.S.B. toward providing appropriate vocational training programs for an increased number of youths. Two very important points about this training which is suggestive of a positive and refreshing look I.I.S.B. administration is giving its programming include:

1. An agency outside of Illinois Youth Commission, the Illinois Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (D.V.R.) is substantially involved in providing this in-institutional job placement. The efforts of D.V.R. and I.Y.C. are well-integrated within the institution, with the D.V.R. rehabilitation counselor providing a useful service to the institutional program and to the individual youths. It is illustrative of a program which, though literally brought in by an outside resource, is perceived by institutional administration and staff as serving needs of I.I.S.B. Thus, even though some staff may not fully value the program's worth (in terms of its affecting attitudinal change in the youth which will bring him closer to achieving a normative integration with the conventions of the home community -- a statement of

treatment goals often suggested in correctional philosophy) they do appreciate the (a) impact immediacy of the program, (b) closeness of program content to extra-institutional work and achievement settings, (c) perceived opportunity to help their own work setting by possibly reducing recidivism (meaning to them, lowered institutional population), and lessening the amount of unstructured time available to the youths in the institution. While they may also appreciate attitudinal changes and rehabilitative processes seen in the youths, this is in this sense not relevant to having resistant staff participate in and encourage a program which they perceive as being helpful to their personal or job role needs.

2. As important as the preceeding discussion, but in terms of institutional management for treatment programming, is the growing emphasis on youth-centered activities as a replacement for institution-centered programming. Administration is gradually introducing a growing number of programs which are directly related to staff-perceived

estimated needs of the individual youths (as established by clinical staff diagnostic activity of various sorts). Youths are placed, when policy and availability of resource will permit, in programs which are dependent upon factors such as:

1. Individual youth personality resources available to successfully perform in a given institution setting now -- and post-institutional settings;
2. Availability of home-community employment or resources for the particular youth and his social-psychological characteristics, which will be adequate for post-institutional programming;
3. Likelihood of success in a given program at I.I.S.B. (in terms of attainment for the individual youth);
4. Social context of the program, including its potential for producing interactional changes for the youth in his relations with the institutional peer-group and his post-institutional community peer-group;
5. Functional ability of youths considered in terms of their likelihood to have positive achievement experiences in contrast to frequently occurring histories of failure and rejection by the free-community society.

While these considerations are not stated as such by the clinical staff at I.I.S.B, interviews suggest that considerable weight is given here which, is some manner, counterbalances the more traditional items used in program assignment (offenses in past, etc.). It would be quite misleading to say, however, that the security-custody orientation is no longer present. If it would be possible, for example, to categorize a treatment-security continuum on the basis of institutional administration and programming into three classifications, such as: (1) security paramount with treatment having a distinctly secondary role; (2) security and treatment playing approximately co-equal roles (with programming of each operation dependent upon approval of both orientations); and (3) treatment and rehabilitation the significant institutional goal, but within the context of externally-imposed organizational administrative factors (such as maximum-security designation) --then, it is probable that I.I.S.B. is in the middle category and, in some ways, is moving toward the third type presented here. Without question, until very recent years, I.I.S.B. was strongly entrenched in the first type of structure.

b. Staff Training

It is understandable that employees of an institution which has been publicly investigated and indicted, such as was the case of I.I.S.B. in 1961, will be cautious of their comments and thinking about future events at I.I.S.B. -- particularly when with non-I.Y.C. personnel. But it is interesting to speculate about the attitude-changes of personnel remaining after 1961 and how staff training activity was or might have been involved. Unfortunately, reliable information from administrative people, then present, is unavailable to the intern; but there is ample reason to believe, on the basis of parts of many interviews, that the then-new superintendent made it amply clear certain practices (brutality, taletelling, etc.) would not be tolerated. Pressure was exerted by administration on all supervisors to ensure their cooperation in new programming and to obtain their support in effecting a major orientation change in the guard force -- a practice which presumably continues even at this writing. The pressure referred to came in innumerable conferences between administration and the supervisor force, and then between the supervisors and the guard staff. Perhaps the initial emphasis in these conferences was a list of "thou-shall-nots" but other materials were offered in later phases which dealt with what might be termed a proto-treatment programming and philosophy. Although such attitudinal retraining (or, if one were to be skeptical and iconoclastic, it might be termed "group rethink by rote") has diminished considerably in quantity, although not necessarily in quality, as the 1961 scandal seemed increasingly remote, there are still occasional group conferences dealing with various factors in or approaches to the guard's role at I.I.S.B. Much more frequent are individual conferences for one or two guards with a representative of administration to discuss particular problems arising out of institutional management. Although these latter conferences usually deal with specific youth-staff interactional problems, there is a planned attempt at each such meeting to go somewhat beyond mere problem-solving and aid the guard to better understand his role as it will influence treatment programming for the individual youth. To a large extent (albeit unmeasured, I must add,) administration feels it is accomplishing much towards improving its guard force impact on the youth through these conferences. To sum up, a program of informal and generally situationdictated in-service training has been applied to the guard force. While it has been effective to some degree, its very organization has inherently limited its capability to provide extended, continuing training for the entire guard force. In addition, there is no realistic way to know how effective this "training" has been or how alternative training models could have more/less effectively enhanced the treatment programming at I.I.S.B.

New employees at I.I.S.B. all receive some measure of orientation training with general emphasis given to on-the-job situations and requirements. Guards, for example, are given several varied kinds of assignments the first week or two, have a conference with administration, and spend additional time with other mature employees. Very little is assumed by administration about the recruitment/selection process except in very broad background particulars, education being one example.

The new employee is observed by both his supervisor and various administrative staff during his six-month probationary period for any sign of untoward problems of accepting either the institutionalization of youth or of adequately relating to the youths under his supervision (in terms of patience, understanding, self-respect, and guidance). He will be counseled about shortcomings during the probationary period. Some new guards will leave the employment during this period (for reasons such as non-acceptance of program or youths, better financial opportunities elsewhere, physical isolation of I.I.S.B., etc.) while others will be asked to leave because of either (a.) derelict job performance or (b) inability of the guard to accept and positively participate in the programming. The turnover rate of new employees is high enough to be of some concern to administration, but then so is the attrition rate of older staff. Reportedly, a new Illinois Department of Personnel salary schedule authorized in July, 1967 will partly reduce the turnover as starting salaries become competitive with the regional economy; the starting guards salary, for example, being increased to $415 per month (from $370) and the special education teacher to a starting figure near $700 (from a previous $470 figure). Most other salary categories have also risen substantially.

It is interesting to note that although most of the previous discussion has centered around orientation and retention problems for the guard category, much the same is true for the professional staff members. For example, the casework staff receives orientation conferences with administration, works briefly *with* the guard force, and has departmental conferences. As the quality of individual guards will differ appreciably throughout I.I.S.B., so it is true of the casework staff who show similar extremes of permissiveness and rigidity in interacting with the youths assigned to their caseload. Turnover of professional personnel is considerable at I.I.S.B. with only three staff being present for more than the past five years. Attrition is generally attributed to better (more pay, less frustration, less physical isolation, more allegedly positive programming) employment opportunities elsewhere. There is also considerable evidence that many staff have become resigned to what *they* come to perceive (after a period of employment at I.I.S.B. but, in part, is the employee's perception of other I.Y.C. facilities effectiveness or ineffectiveness as seen by the return of recidivists to Sheridan. Again, administration's method of handling this attitude of defeatism is mainly through individual conferences with emphasis on problem-situations rather than a broad type of attitude-restructuring involving utilization of the staff peer group as a positive strength. While the former is necessary with the individual, there is every reason to believe that individual conferences will have new and desirable impact on a staff member's acceptance of and participation in institutional treatment programming; if, a structured and appropriate in-service training has provided the basis for understanding of agency and institutional goals, methods, philosophy, evaluation criteria, and so on. At present, there is one activity at I.I.S.B. which, in a limited way, provides a start on the information-imparting and attitude-consensus urged in the previous sentence. This activity is the frequent clinical staff conferences attended by most caseworkers and certain other staff.

The staff conference receives minimal administrative direction in that the meetings are mainly without an administrative representative being continually present. On occasion, a visiting consultant from the behavioral sciences area in nearby universities will attend the staff meetings to help work through troublesome problems and to provide some basic theoretical material about this type of work setting. Reports indicate that such consultants are well-received and have been useful to staff in these areas. These meetings pertain almost exclusively to situation-problems and (on occasions occurring in a cyclical fashion) gripe sessions which are basically non-productive in the view of administration perhaps; because, the gripes presented were pointed towards other institutions or the I.Y.C. agency itself, either of which apparently are beyond the limits of local-institution constructive suggestion or proposal. Since unresolved gripes, while allowing some hyperventilation for staff, will ultimately result in deleterious effects to an organization's internal structure and functioning, the staff conferences were considerably curtailed some months ago by administration which effectively rationalized the increased workload and absences attributable to summer vacation scheduling problems. Administration plans to resume these staff conferences in September of 1967.

It was pointed out to the intern that a number of staff are attending university-credit classes at regional campuses and that tuition support has been provided by I.I.S.B. A rough estimate is that perhaps 50% of the clinical casework and academic staff are doing college-level work in content areas appropriate to their employment.

In addition, I.I.S.B. has supported tuition costs for several of the guard staff to take specific courses. A third area of university-based training for corrections personnel, as it relates to I.I.S.B., is the provision by the agency of at least one university-credit course for various staff during the past year in the conventional residence classroom setting at Northern Illinois University. Apparently, staff from several Illinois Youth Commission facilities in the region registered for the course and were quite accepting of the materials presented. There are plans to have a similar arrangement this fall with the course designed to aid staff toward an understanding of group counseling theory and practice. There is much interest by I.I.S.B. administration in this course since it is felt that this can be a valuable tool in an integrated treatment program of training, counseling, and organization for security. Tentatively, several I.I.S.B. staff have been scheduled to attend this course on their own time, but with the agency paying the tuition costs.

c. Training Implications

The nature of I.I.S.B. is such that it is physically isolated, has tightly-controlled security, gives heavy quantitative emphasis to custodial staffing in contrast with non-custodial, has a stigma from the past, is rather small and compact, and contains a population which has been officially identified by the community and agency as being its "worst" youths. Given this setting, it is essential for administration to examine how staff training programming will affect the institution, its unofficial power structure, rapport with the parent agency, the need to redefine goals and procedures at all levels, and the ability to permit or cause appropriate innovative program change and the consequent changes in employee roles. If a staff training program at I.I.S.B. is to proceed beyond the mundane, though necessary, operations of orientation and administrative staff conferences, it must be able to conceptualize the operations of an institution and adequately relate this to theory from the behavioral sciences. It is through such relationships that an index of program effectiveness, validity, and reliability can be established for further focused staff training -- in addition to treatment program modification.

A second point concerning staff training is especially apropo to the I.I.S.B. setting. The relative compactness and smallness of the institution (compared to other general I.Y.C. units) makes it essential that administration participate fully and provide strong endorsement for the goals, methods and peculiarities of staff training programming. It is obvious that administration can probably give little "real-time" to the program, but an individual whose responsibility is staff training should be in a position to structure that portion of the administrator's time available in the most effective manner possible for the program; for example, an occasional discussion involving cross-occupational groups at I.I.S.B. with the administrator and an outside consultant. Here, the moral support of administration is given to the staff trainer as well as an implied attachment of importance to what is being presented. (It is obvious that such kinds of meetings could be quite traumatic, although not necessarily unproductive to staff training, if the consultant and administrator were in substantial disagreement. Some caution in matching is suggested.

A third point concerns institutional programming both in terms of managerial systems and stated or real goals. Perhaps at I.I.S.B., more so than in any other Illinois

Youth Commission facility, the procedures, goals, and philosophy are most susceptible to identification -- and therefore for investigation, evaluation, and reformulation. In part, this is due (a) to the compactness of authority structure within the institution and (b) to the inability of I.I.S.B. to "pass the buck" by transferring youths who cannot be tolerated in a given institution, to another setting. For the agency, Sheridan is the end-of-line for institutional and community incorrigibility or acting-out behavior. Therefore, I.I.S.B. must produce a program which can encompass the most extreme anti-social behavior as well as construct a model for rehabilitation and treatment. While no such program has been formally spelled-out either in the institution or in the parent agency, my observation is that circumstances at I.I.S.B. (including a cooperative administration, especially) would permit a researcher to do interesting, potentially productive work in this setting. By the same token, it is quite likely that appropriate staff training, internally-controlled but with substantial outside help from the parent agency, would be accepted and endorsed by I.I.S.B. administration.

A final point concerns the ironic situation in which we find this most-closed institution participating more fully than any other major agency facility with an outside agency in a systematized and integrated manner. The cooperative program with the Illinois Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is a workable and working activity which is considerably removed from the stereotype that exists for many that I.I.S.B. is a "prison for kids". It is possible that, in light of the above, I.I.S.B. would be a good location for an N.I.M.H.-funded demonstration-project in treatment of juvenile delinquents. Certainly, staff training could well be crucial in such a program to permit fullest development of the demonstration program's potential.

7. Other Subunits

Four other divisions of the Illinois Youth Commission were not investigated beyond a brief review. Therefore, we are not in a position to comment upon staff training practices of these units.

8. Some Further Comments

Since the original preparation of this report during the summer of 1967, a number of changes have taken place within the agency and its staff-training program. In terms of the latter, agency efforts give the appearance of moving towards an attitude of greater priority for staff in-service training. A number of activities could be pointed out, as well as agency-wide interest. However, our feeling remains steadfast that the agency can be best served by a coordinated agency-wide program of staff development which will take into account all the many factors in Illinois Youth Commission operation. Therefore, we must again strongly advocate formal implementation of a state-level coordinator position with the responsibility and adequate authority for agency staff-training. Specific recommendations are outlined in the Appendix of this report.

One other comment needs to be made. Recently, this report has been the subject of considerable discussion by agency personnel. Insightful and provocative comments have been elicited from staff and administration. And, there has been a small amount of emotional hostility.

By far the greater reaction, however, has been one of real interest and a positive willingness to re-examine old philosophies and methods in the quest for greater operational effectives and economy. Thus, we feel this report has already partially served the needs of Illinois corrections generally; and the Illinois Youth Commission, in particular.

Recommendations For Agency Staff Training Programming

In this section, the writer proposes to make a number of recommendations having relevance for staff training in the agency and its divisions. Each recommendation results from careful consideration of the total agency, its resources and programs, and the place of the Illinois Youth Commission in relation to overall society. There is an intended consistency and "building-on" quality to the recommendations since the writer must believe that only through such an integrated approach can staff training be effectively meshed with agency treatment programming.

As was mentioned previously, this report is the work of one individual and does not reflect official endorsement by any other individual, group, or organization. The recommendations which follow are predicted upon this assumption.

1. It is recommended that the Illinois Youth Commission establish the position -- Coordinator of Staff Training and Program Development. This full-time position should be occupied by an individual having adequate training, background, and motivation to successfully initiate

and follow-through in a statewide program. Further, it is recommended

a. That this position be full-time;

b. That this position be directly responsible to the agency chairman;

c. That it be adequately funded for state-level functions through the state central office;

d. That this position, in its relation to agency divisions, be advisory -- but with substantial powers of persuasiveness;

d

e. That the person in this position have overall responsibility (subject to the Chairman's approval) for survey, design, implementation, and evaluation of an agency-wide staff training program;

f. That the person in this position serve as an advisor and consultant to the Commission and agency division in matters of staff training and program development;

g. That the person in this position on the basis of initial and continuing surveys of agency needs related to staff training, suggest for approval by facility administration (or agency administration when major changes are indicated) modifications of training in terms of focus, quantity, quality -- particularly as it will effect achievement of agency or facility goals;

h. That this person will serve as a consultant to the agency staff in their planning and development of new treatment programming, and the preparation of proposals for new programs (including those involving federal grant applications);

2. It is recommended that each division and large unit of the Illinois Youth Commission have an individual whose major responsibility is staff training and program development. Further, it is recommended that, as a minimum:

a. The following units warrant consideration for a full-time person:
   Illinois State Training School for Boys
   Field Services Division
   Forestry Camp Division;

b. The following units warrant consideration for sharing of one or more full-time persons:
   Reception-Diasgnostic Center
   Special Education Schools
   Training School for Girls
   Industrial School for Boys;

c. Such persons be directly responsible to the division or unit administrator, but also with a direct link to the state-level Coordinator of Staff Training and Program Development;

d. This position and its activities be funded from local budgets supplemented, where necessary and appropriate, by central office funds;

e. Persons in this position ascertain definitively those areas needing training activity, arrange an appropriate training program with administrative approval, implement, and provide evaluation devices for such training;

f. The persons assigned to these facility training positions be selected by the facility administrator (with concurrent approval of the agency-level

Coordinator) in terms of insightful, persuasive, motivated capacities -- and that the person selected be imaginative;

g. The persons so selected be encouraged to utilize outside-of-agency resources in staff training.

3. It is recommended that serious consideration be given to the establishment of a separate Training Center for all staff levels adjacent to or part of (but semi-independent of) a current facility, to provide orientation, continuation, and special training. Further, it is recommended

a. That the facility be attached to a current facility for physical support, but that organization and administration be semi-independent;

b. That the facility be organizationally-designed to provide various types of training: orientation of new employees; all forms of in-service training; refresher courses of various duration; experimental training approaches;

c. That the facility be staffed by one permanent cadre and rotating trainers (and similar persons having special knowledge) from the various divisions;

d. The federal-funding be sought to help support the first two-three years of operation;

e. That the facility programs be particularly designed to facilitate new agency programming in terms of treatment and rehabilitation methods;

f. That, as a minimum, each agency employee having substantial client contact have a refresher course (of varying contents) each three years at the facility;

g. That a major emphasis of the Training Center be to provide appropriate in-service training programs in the field.

4. It is recommended that, in the light of a severe shortage of qualified counseling professionals, consideration be given to redefining the non-professional's role to include a counseling function; and, to be most effective, appropriate training be provided to learn and support this new role. Further, it is recommended

a. That the agency provide, through its Coordinator of Staff Training and Program Development, a systematic training plan for non-professional staff having substantial client contact which will increase their competence for counseling within specified perimeters of action;

b. That training be conducted wherever most economical and convenient, by both agency staff and outside-of-agency consultants;

c. That advanced counseling training be provided those non-professionals showing particular capacity for this function -- and that additional motivation be provided in terms of such factors as salary increases, new personnel code titles, and so on;

d. That the new role be psychologically-supported by agency and division professional staff through conferences, lectures, outside consultant acquisition, and so on.

5. It is recommended that the Illinois Youth Commission go beyond its own staff, wherever appropriate, to obtain necessary consultant and/or instructional staff for staff

training programming. Further, it is recommended

a. That, when economically feasible and programatically desireable, outside-of-agency consultants be sought on a temporary or continuing basis for staff training activities;

b. That federal agencies concerned with social welfare programs be canvassed for grant or consultation assistance in staff training;

c. That a permanent liaison be developed with one or more colleges/universities having substantial interests in the area of corrections, as an aid and guide to staff training;

d. That preliminary steps be explored in the development of a regional training center to serve several states, selected employee groups with specific training situations apropo to juvenile corrections;

e. That the idea of recruitment and training volunteers for selected work-situations within the agency divisions (youth-contact situations) be explored, especially as regards the type of training most suitable;

f. That the development of a permanent volunteer cadre of special trainers from without the agency be explored.

6. It is recommended that the Illinois Youth Commission encourage students interested in juvenile corrections as a professional career through a carefully planned program of stipends and work experiences. Further, it is recommended

a. That stipends be made available, consistent with available funding, to students engaged in the internship phase of professional education (social work, psychology, sociology, rehabilitation counseling, activity therapy, recreational therapy, and professional business management);

b. That stipends be made available in a few cases to students who are engaged in training for the fields listed above, but who have not yet reached the internship stage;

c. That internships for the professional fields listed above be made available (and be encouraged) within the agency and its divisions, and that competent staff devote adequate time to give such students appropriate supervision;

d. That the agency make available to institutions of higher education the agency and division as a training ground for students in fields having interest appropriate to agency functions (and consistent with agency and client safeguards, economy, and administration).

7. It is recommended that strong consideration be given to that development, distribution, and implementation of an agency policy and operating manual. Further, it is recommended

a. That such a manual(s) be written to definitively state agency and division goals, policies, and procedures;

b. That such a manual(s) be written in terms which are practical for all concerned levels of agency staff;

c. That all manuals be kept current, both by the agency and by individuals receiving such manuals;

d. That manuals carefully spell-out the agency and division staff training programs in broad, but workable terms.

8. It is recommended that the Illinois Youth Commission consider an increased program of staff training

Futher, it is recommended

a. That staff training be viewed as a priority item in agency and division administration, especially insofar as agency treatment programming effectivity is concerned;

b. That funds be allocated from state central office and division budgets to ensure at least a minimum program of focused training and program development;

c. That situations be sought in agency programming which could benefit from strengthened staff training activity, and that such training be provided.

d. That training priorities be established within the agency and divisions, with the final pattern providing a systematic and integrated approach to the total agency program;

e. That sufficient material and monetary resources be made available for staff training to make it viable and continuing activity;

f. That evaluation devices be built into all staff training programs within the agency, to the end that training may be reformulated as necessary to meet new needs and problem areas.

9. It is recommended that the Administrative Services Division engage in a series of activities, coordinated with the efforts of the Coordinator, designed to aid in operationalizing and supporting an agency-wide staff training program.

a. That the Personnel section develop mechanisms for materially demonstrating the agency's interest in having all staff successfully participate in training;

b. That the Public Relations section develop a series of economical information pamphlets for intra-agency and outside-of-agency distribution;

c. That the Supervisor of this Division explore arrangements for a system of shared time and shared cost, especially for items/services which are very costly or in short supply.

10. It is recommended that, as program change or demonstration programs are developed, the needs and advantages of appropriate staff training be built-in to the planning and implementation phases.

11. It is recommended that, in conjunction with the agency public relations staff, an intensive and well-grounded internal information program be promulgated among agency personnel.

12. It is recommended that special attention be given in all phases of staff training to the continued integration of agency division functions as they bear on the continuum of youth involvement with the agency.

ERIC Clearinghouse
APR 6 1970
on Adult Education